

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)

VOL. IV

JULY, 1940

No. 3

THE LITURGY AND REUNION III

THE WORDS OF CONSECRATION IN THE TRADITION OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

IN the following pages we aim at setting forth, as objectively as possible, and in a quite eirenic frame of mind, the tradition of the Christian East regarding the use and import of the Words of Consecration—some writers prefer to speak of the Recital of the Dominical Words of Institution—during the celebration of the Eucharist.

As we see it, out of the numerous modern studies¹ of the Eucharistic Anaphora in general and of the Epiclesis in particular, two points emerge as proven beyond any serious doubt: (i) the universal use² of "the recital of the Words of Institution" at the culminating moment of the Anaphora. This recital is worded differently but not once does it fail to contain the crucial sentence uttered by Christ "This is My Body—This is My Blood." And (ii) the varying use of an Epiclesis or Invocation. This invocation is addressed in some Liturgies to God the Son, in others to God the Holy Ghost;

¹We have made use chiefly of the following works: P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie: La Présence Réelle et la Transsubstantiation*. 6th ed. Paris, 1913. Dom P. Cagin, *L'Anaphore Apostolique et ses Témoins*. Paris, 1919. M. de la Taille, S.J., *Mysterium Fidei*, 2nd ed., Paris, 1924, pp. 431-472. Dom F.-J. Moreau, *Les Liturgies Eucharistiques. Notes sur leur origine et leur développement*. Paris, 1924. Card. Ild. Schuster, O.S.B., *The Sacramentary (Liber Sacramentorum)*. English translation by Arthur Levelis-Marke, M.A. Vol. I, Part II, ch. III. *The Origin and Evolution of the 'Ordinarium Missae'*, pp. 262-318. London, 1924. M. Jugie, A.A., *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*. Tom. III. *De Sacramentis*, pp. 256-301: *De forma Euch. De Epiclesi*. Paris, 1930. A. G. Hebert, *The Meaning of the Epiclesis*. Published by the S.P.C.K., Oct. 1933. W. H. Frere, C.R., D.D., sometime Bishop of Truro, *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer. An eirenic study in Liturgical History*. London, 1938. Dom F. Cabrol, *Epiclèse*. Col. 142-184, Vol. V, part I of *Dictionnaire d'Arch. Chrétienne et de Liturgie*.

²It seems that 'here is one doubtful exception.

in some it is placed before the Words of Institution, in others after the same; in some the Divine Person to whom the invocation is addressed is asked only to apply the fruits of Holy Communion to the faithful, in others—chiefly in those of more recent date—the Holy Spirit is invoked, after the recital of the Institution, in order that He may deign to change the Eucharistic offerings into the Body and Blood of Christ; lastly, in all present-day Eastern Liturgies the invocation is to be found in a fully developed form, whereas in the Roman Rite and all others derived therefrom, there is only a faint trace of it. In one word: the Recital of the Words of Institution is a fixed feature in all the Liturgies, Eastern and Western; the Invocation or Epiclesis is not.

Now, anyone who studies the question with an unbiased mind and grips these basic facts, if asked to decide where he considers the essential element in the celebration of the Eucharist is to be found—that is, whether in the Recital of the Words of Institution or in the Epiclesis—could not but choose the former as a matter of course.¹ This is what Catholic tradition has done in the West as well as in the East. It has always held, and still holds, that the Recital of the Dominical Words contains in fact the essential words which *do* consecrate the bread and the wine—the Words of Consecration. Most Eastern theologians on the other hand—roughly those who have written since the second half of the fourth century—count the Epiclesis also as forming an integral part of the formula of consecration.

Since the human mind always works along logical lines, it was only to be expected that in the course of centuries the question should be raised: At what precise moment is Christ present on the Altar? This question emanated from minds filled to overflowing with filial reverence towards the great Mystery of Faith enacted at the Mass. The faithful Christian wanted to ascertain the exact point of time at which he could say, That is bread, or, That is God; in order on the one hand to avoid committing an act of idolatry by worshipping a material object, and on the other hand to know when to fall prostrate in an act of supreme adoration to his God.²

¹ This is precisely the course followed by most Greek and Anglican divines, when deciding in favour of the laying-on of hands as the essential factor in the Sacrament of Holy Order and dismissing the use of instruments as a *Latin* addition. They seem to forget this line of argument when dealing with the *Eastern* epiclesis.

² We consider Bishop Frere's explanation (op. cit., pp. 179-180) a travesty of the real facts. The argument *Hoc post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, though often "catchy," should always be avoided in serious theological or historical discussion.

It was the duty of Catholic theologians to give him a definite answer. They gave it, basing their discussion on the tradition of Catholic worship. The answer of the Latin Fathers was this: The divine change takes place as soon as the priest, in the person of Christ, repeats the Words of Institution: This is My Body, This is My Blood. The answer of the Easterns is best given in a quotation from the Russian Orthodox *Longer Catechism*¹: "*Q. What is the most essential act in the Liturgy of the Faithful? A. The utterance of the Words which Jesus Christ spake in instituting the sacrament, Take, eat, this is my Body. Drink ye all of it, for this is my Blood of the new Covenant; and after this the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, and the blessing of the gifts, that is the bread and wine which have been offered. Q. Why is this so essential? A. Because at the moment of this act the bread and wine are changed, or transubstantiated, into the very Body of Christ and into the very Blood of Christ.*"

The following Fathers are usually cited as witnesses to the Eastern tradition which attributes the Eucharistic consecration to the Words of Institution.

St. Justin (*c.* 100—*c.* 163), an Eastern who died a Martyr in Rome, in his first Apology, written about the year 155, has the following passage²: "And this food is called by us Eucharist . . . For we do not receive these (the Eucharistic species) as ordinary food or ordinary drink; but, as by the word of God, Jesus our Saviour made flesh hath both flesh and blood for our salvation, in like manner the food made Eucharist by the prayer of the word which proceeded from Him—*οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν*—and from which our flesh and blood by assimilation are nourished, is, as we have been taught, both flesh and blood of that same Jesus Who was made flesh.

"For the Apostles in their memorials called Gospels which they wrote, recorded that they were given commandment thus: That Jesus, taking bread and giving thanks, said: 'Do this in remembrance of Me; this is my Body.' And likewise, after taking the cup and giving thanks, He said: 'This is my Blood,' and He distributed it to them alone."

The phrase *λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ* which might perhaps be better rendered "the word used by Him," can only refer to the words of Institution, which, moreover, are given below by St. Justin himself, as if to take away all reason for misconstruction or misunderstanding. The obvious meaning, therefore, of this famous passage of St. Justin is that the

¹ Quotation in Frere, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

² *Apol. I*, n. 66. P.G., T. 6, col. 428.

Eucharistic change is wrought by the Words of Christ, "This is My Body," "This is my Blood," repeated by the priest in remembrance of what Christ did at the Last Supper.

St. Irenæus (c. 140—c. 202), Bishop of Lyons, but an Eastern by origin and connections, writes as follows¹: "When the mingled cup and the made bread receive the word of God—ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ—and become the Eucharist, the Body of Christ." Note the expression, ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ which most fittingly applies to Christ's Words of Institution.

We mention in passing the Egyptians Clement of Alexandria², Origen³, and St. Athanasius⁴, whose usual phrase when referring to the consecration of the Eucharist is also ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ; and the Anaphora of Serapion, written c. 350, the oldest specimen of Anaphoras handed down to us *in extenso*.⁵ In this, the Invocation, which immediately follows the Recital, is addressed to the λόγος, not to the Holy Ghost. Again St. Ephraem's description of Christ "consecrating the Eucharist for the first time" at the Last Supper is very illuminating.⁶ From Egypt, too, we have the Dêr Balyzeh papyrus, now at the Bodleian, Oxford, another specimen of ancient Egyptian Liturgy, where the invocation to the Holy Ghost immediately precedes the Recital.⁷

St. Gregory of Nazianzos (c. 329—390) "favours," writes Frere,⁸ "a Logos-invocation." As a matter of fact, the Saint, asking the prayers of his priest-friend Amphilochius, entreats him to do so especially "when with the word thou bringest down the Word—λόγῳ κατέλκῃς τὸν λόγον."⁹

St. Gregory of Nyssa (c. 335—394) is also very explicit¹⁰: "The bread, as the Apostle says¹¹, is hallowed 'through the word of God and prayer,' so that it is at once changed into the Body of the λόγος as the λόγος Himself said, 'This is My Body.' " The "prayer" is here mentioned to round off the quotation from St. Paul.¹²

¹ *Adv. Haereses*, Lib. V, ch. II, n. 3. P.G., Tom. 7, col. 1125. See also Lib. IV, ch. 17 and 18. P.G., ib., col. 1027.

² *Strom.* VII, VI, 31.

³ τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον διὰ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεϊξεως (In I Tim., 4, 5).

⁴ καταβαίνει ὁ λόγος εἰς τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ γίνεται αὐτοῦ σῶμα (P.G., Tom. 86, Ps. II, col. 2401).

⁵ See Batiffol, *op. cit.*, pp. 312 sqq.

⁶ *Serm. in Hebd. Sanct.* 4, 4-6; Cfr. de la Taille, *op. cit.*, p. 440, note.

⁷ Cfr. Cabrol, *op. cit.*, col. 146; also Frere, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-85.

⁸ Frere, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

⁹ Ep. 171, *ad Amphilochium*. P.G., Tom. 37, col. 280.

¹⁰ *Oratio Catech.* 27. P.G., T. 45, col. 97.

¹¹ I Tim., iv, 5.

¹² Cfr. Jugie, *op. cit.*, p. 259. Cfr. also Frere, *op. cit.*, pp. 87-90; de la Taille, *op. cit.*, p. 440; Cabrol, *op. cit.*, col. 147, sqq.

We come next to the most representative of all the Eastern writers, and indeed of all the Fathers, on the doctrine of the Eucharist, St. John Chrysostom (344—407), who on account of his momentous pronouncements on the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, has been gratefully styled by Catholics "the Doctor of the Eucharist"—*Doctor Eucharistiæ*. He is the clearest of all the Eastern Fathers on the point under consideration. We give only two passages¹ from his writings: "It is not man who causes the offerings to become the Body and the Blood of Christ; but the same Christ Who was crucified for us. The priest stands representing Him, uttering those same words, but the power and the grace is from God. He says 'This is My Body.' This word (saying) transforms the offerings τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα." Again²: "The oblation is the same whosoever may offer it, whether Paul or Peter; one and the same is that which Christ gave to His disciples and that which is now offered up by the priests. The latter oblation is in no way inferior to the former, because it is not men who consecrate the latter, but the He Who consecrated the former. For as the words which God then uttered are the same as those which are now repeated by the priest, so the oblation too is the same."

It is needless to labour these texts; they are obvious in their import.³ Indeed, in no passage does St. Chrysostom attribute the work of transubstantiation directly to the Holy Ghost; in the texts where there is a reference to the Holy Ghost, St. Chrysostom attributes to Him the sanctification of the faithful through Holy Communion⁴, not the Eucharistic change.

No wonder, therefore, that at the Council of Florence, on July 5th, 1439, Cardinal Bessarion could emphatically declare on behalf of the Greeks⁵: "Since in our former meetings, among other differences, there has arisen a doubt as to the consecration of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and some suspect that we and our Church do not believe that that most precious Sacrament is wrought through the words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, we have here before your

¹ Homil. I, *de proditiōe Judæe*, n. 6, P.G., Tom. 49, col. 380.

² In Epit. II ad Tim., hom. 2, n. 4. P.G., Tom. 62, col. 612.

³ See also *De Sancta Pentecoste*, Hom. I, 4. P.G., T. 50, col. 459; *De Sacerdotio*, Lib. III, 4. P.G., Tom. 48, col. 642; Hom. 24 in I Cor. P.G., Tom. 61, col. 204; *De Sacerdotio*, Lib. VI, n. 4.

⁴ Cfr. Jugie, op. cit., p. 261, note.

⁵ P.G., Tom. 161, col. 491. Cfr. also Bessarion's treatise *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ, et quibus verbis Christi Corpus conficiatur*. P.G., Tom. 161, col. 493—526. Mark of Ephesus was the only one to remonstrate at the Council; but then, he had remonstrated also on the question of the *Filioque* and others. See Jugie, op. cit., p. 295, sqq.

Holiness to declare that since from all the holy Doctors of the Church, and especially from St. John Chrysostom, the best known to us, we have heard that the Dominical words are those which change and transubstantiate the bread and wine into the true Body and Blood of Christ, and that those divine words of the Saviour have the full power of transubstantiation—*omnem virtutem transsubstantiationis habent*—we of necessity follow that Doctor and his judgement.”

It is interesting to compare the doctrine of St. Chrysostom with that of his Latin contemporary, St. Ambrose (c. 333—397), so well known in Church History for his close affinity with the Greeks. He writes¹: “*Ipse (Christus) offertur in terris quando Christi Corpus offertur: immo Ipse offerre manifestatur in nobis, cujus Sermo sanctificat sacrificium quod offertur.*” Somewhat later, the author of the work *De Sacramentis*, for a long time attributed to St. Ambrose himself, can write with scholastic accuracy²:

—“*Quomodo potest qui panis est corpus esse Christi?*

—*Consecratione.*

—*Consecratio autem quibus verbis est, cujus sermonibus?*

—*Domini Jesu.*

—*Ergo sermo Christi hoc conficit Sacramentum.*”

St. Chrysostom's tradition remained alive in the Church of Antioch. Severus, patriarch of that city in 512, explicitly states that the consecration takes place through the words of Institution, without any mention of the Epiclesis.³

We close the list of quotations with two excerpts from Hesychius, a priest of Jerusalem (d. c. 430)⁴: “The sanctification—consecration—of the mystical sacrifice . . . should be attributed to Him Who is the true priest, because through His power and through the word which He uttered—*et prolatum ab Eo verbum*—the species—*quae apparent*—have been consecrated.” And again⁵: “Through the Dominical word the species are changed into something greater and spiritual.”

Jugie adds an interesting point derived from the ritual used by the Greeks immediately after the recital of the Words of Institution, which goes to show that those who assist at the celebration of the Eucharist believe Christ to be actually present on the Altar as soon as the recital is ended.⁶

Here we end our argument. It is not our purpose to ignore or belittle the fact of the Epiclesis. Here we are concerned

¹ *Enarr. in 12 psalm. david.*, in Ps. 38, P.L., Tom. 14, col. 1051.

² *De Sacr.*, 4, 4, 14. P.L., Tom. 16, col. 439.

³ See the text in full in Cabrol, op. cit., p. 151.

⁴ *In Levit.*, Lib. VI, cap. 22, 14–16. P.G., Tom. 93, col. 1071–1072.

⁵ *Ib.*, col. 891.

⁶ *Cfr. op. cit.*, p. 264, sqq.

only with the other fact—the fact of an Eastern tradition which stands for the Words of Institution as, at any rate, the primary, if not the exclusive, element which transforms the Eucharistic offering. Since the Schism, a few Greek and Russian theologians speak of the Words of Institution as merely a recital, a narrative—διηγηματικά—not as causing the Eucharistic transmutation. On the face of it, this opinion runs counter to the universal tradition of their own Church.

As regards the use of the Epiclesis itself we are fully convinced that originally it was to be found in most Liturgies before the Words of Consecration, much in the same way as we have it now in the prayer *Quam oblationem* of the Latin Canon. If it was placed after the consecration, it was only a prayer to the Holy Ghost to apply the fruits of the Eucharist to the faithful in Holy Communion. This is the opinion of both Cagin¹ and Batiffol. Batiffol indeed writes²: “I am in full agreement with Dom Cagin as regards the Liturgical *contresens* which was committed when some began to point to the Epiclesis to the Holy Ghost as the ‘form’ of consecration.”

Cardinal Schuster is, therefore, amply justified in stating³: “After the prayer for the transubstantiation of the oblations there follows immediately in the Roman Canon the Gospel narrative of the Last Supper, together with the words of the institution of the Holy Eucharist—words to which the Church, speaking by the mouth of the Fathers, has always attached a sacramental efficacy.” And a few pages later⁴: “After the *anamnesis*, which forms an integral part of the consecration of the eucharistic victim, in commemoration of His bloody sacrifice on the cross, there follows at once the offering up of the victim Himself to the Father at the hands of the priest. This is indubitably one of the most important and solemn moments of the liturgical *actio*; it is found in all the ancient liturgies in almost identical terms, even to the phrase τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν, *de tuis donis ac datis*. The matter is important also from the point of view of the Eastern epiclesis which follows this oblation, because, according to the view of the Greeks, who assign consecratory efficacy to the invocation of the Holy Ghost, it is incomprehensible how the *anamnesis* and the *prospophora*, or offering to the Father, can precede the transubstantiation, which constitutes the Host an actual Victim. We must therefore conclude that the existing post-

¹ Op. cit., p. 70, 101.

² Op. cit., p. 359.

³ Schuster, op. cit., p. 290.

⁴ Ib., p. 295-96.

consecratory epiclesis of the Eastern Church, which—after the *anamnesis* and the offering of the sacrifice—still invokes the descent of the Paraclete, in order to effect the transubstantiation of the eucharistic species, is a theological contradiction in terms, and represents a strange and later deviation from the original liturgical conception of the Fathers of the Church and also of the Byzantines, who all of them—as St. Chrysostom, for example—attributed the efficacy of the transubstantiation solely to our Lord's own words."

The Epiclesis, however, as an invocation to the Holy Ghost to sanctify—not precisely consecrate—the offerings has an undeniable beauty all its own—it is founded on the theological truism that all the works whence sanctity is derived are attributed to the operation of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. The very work of the Incarnation is one of them. Surely, the Eucharist, as the very source and fountain of sanctification through the physical contact with Christ, is another. All the other Sacraments come equally under the same heading; indeed, in the administration of most of them, there are to be found invocations to the Holy Ghost similar to the Eastern epiclesis. But this doctrine is upheld by the Latins as much as by the Greek Theologians. The question under consideration is a different one; it refers solely to the Eastern tradition of the Catholic Church regarding the actual words whereby the bread and wine offered on the altar become the Body and the Blood of Christ. We are happy to be able to answer this query in the words of one of the greatest of the Greek Fathers: The priest, in the person of Christ, says "This is my Body." "This is my Blood."

τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα.

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

LITURGY AND THE LOVE OF GOD

AS long as the revealed God of Christianity is Love, man's answer to this revelation, his loving response to the divine advance, will be one of the most cherished themes of human thought. And it is well that in these times of anxieties and strife a theologian should consecrate the firstfruits of his scholastic formation to this subject of the love of God.¹ No one, therefore, would grudge Dom Aelred the wide-spread appreciation of his valuable study.

It is, therefore, not without a certain painful surprise that, when arriving at the chapter on Prayer, the serene development of this serene matter is suddenly seen to be broken off and replaced by a whole-front attack on certain "liturgists." One after the other general accusations are levelled at some unnamed authors and works, relentlessly and without breathing space, for more than ten pages. The result is that, on such a crucial point in the problem of love as prayer, one is left with the final impression that the Liturgy has its good points but is too full of dangers and perplexities and is of too little importance to affect man's ways with God. In fact, not a few of the less perspicacious readers will go away with the idea that Liturgy and love are completely separated, not to say actually opposed, and that love in general suffices for all practical purposes.

I do not intend to start a controversy. Nor do I feel called upon to defend myself or other more distinguished fellow-labourers in the field of the Liturgy against such reproaches as ignorance of theology (p. 148), lack of analytical preparation, incoherence (p. 147), attacks on the Christian principles of renouncement (p. 151) or undue limitation of human personality (p. 149), and many others. I grieve to say that the tone of these accusations is too personal and the statements too slashing and unfounded to be compatible with academic form. I know a great many "liturgists" and find that no one is more careful and responsible in matters theological than they. If they use St. Thomas in order to surpass him, with the help of Holy Scripture (especially St. John and St. Paul) and the Fathers and the life of the Church at large, to solve problems created by six centuries of fast going history, are they wrong? Being mainly concerned with the *life* of the Christian man of to-day (even more than with abstract theology, though making full use of it), they aim at an undetermined audience. This implies a treatment which, on the one

¹ *The Love of God*, by Dom Aelred Graham. Longmans, 1939.

hand, prevents them from "showing off" the underlying research work in erudition and theology and makes prejudiced theologians accuse them of "imagination, personal vision and mere zeal," and, on the other hand, makes them try to meet the demand of those theologians as far as possible by consistency and accuracy which makes the man-in-the-street accuse them of being "high-brow." Must such workers be disparaged because they obey to a duty and a vocation without human respect and in spite of being conscious of being placed between two fires? But enough of this. If our work survives future generations will judge on which side there was the greater knowledge, the deeper sense of responsibility and the stronger loyalty to our mission as Christians, may I add: as the perfect Christians which monks ought to be.

Discarding, then, all controversy my only preoccupation is to clear up a few misunderstandings. And this I desire to do, not for any personal justification (although those who have read *Liturgy and Life* will easily recognize who is the scape-goat), nor even for the justification of men like Dom Bernard McElligott and Dom Gregory Murray (to whom the passage on "musical feelings" is apparently addressed) who do such fine work with the Society of St. Gregory or with *Music and Liturgy*, nor Father Martindale who in a recent article (*The Month*, April number) showed once more the urgency of the Liturgy for the re-Christianization of our own country and for the world at large. I simply reply for the sake of the cause of the Liturgy itself. For, although Dom Aelred professes to attack only a few "liturgists," the fact that he does not mention any names or works will make the ordinary reader look at *all* "liturgists" with suspicion or wonder. Moreover, *de facto* his attack is directed against the basic structural elements of the Liturgy itself, such as the Sacraments and common prayer. And since very few readers will expect such an attack upon the Liturgy of the Church in a book entitled *The Love of God* the harm done by this one chapter will be the worse for being apparently "incidental" and surrounded with a wealth of common theology with which nobody will dream of disagreeing.

The attack rests mainly on one argument which may be summed up as follows. The exterior acts of cult (St. Thomas uses the word *caeremonialia*) belong to the virtue of religion. The virtue of religion is theologically classified under the moral virtue of justice, and, therefore, like all moral virtues, is subordinated to the theological virtues of which love is the queen. On this argument Dom Aelred bases his claim to minimize (*de facto*) the Liturgy at large. The argument does

not hold for the simple reason that virtue of religion and Liturgy are not two coextensive terms, and therefore the conclusion exceeds the premisses.

Even if we reduce the Liturgy to "Christian cult" in the strict sense of the term, we are not allowed to identify it with the virtue of religion. This virtue, because only a virtue, contains nothing but human actions. The Liturgy, Christian cult, contains not only human actions but also, and even principally, divine actions: the Mass and the Sacraments, of which God is and remains the main and first operative Cause. That the Priest is instrumental cause does not prevent the first Cause from acting directly, as the common Thomistic doctrine of instrumental causality shows. There are moreover the actions in which the Church as such is the principal agent, and recent theologians (Abbot Vonier and others) take it that this holds for the sacramentalia, amongst which many reckon the Divine Office. This confusion of Liturgy and virtue of religion was bound to happen in the author's case since he clung too exclusively to the *IIa IIae* where St. Thomas treats of the natural law only and of its highest cultural expression in the Jewish cult. If St. Thomas deliberately postponed the Christian cult to its actual place after the Christology he did so precisely because of the sacraments and the Mass, which are the main preoccupation of the "liturgists." St. Thomas indeed introduces his teaching on the sacraments as follows: "After having considered what belongs to the Mysteries of the Word Incarnate, we must consider the Sacraments of the Church which have their efficacy from this very Word Incarnate." Overlooking such a vital part of St. Thomas' work, limiting himself to the two lowest theological sources, human reason, and the authority of theologians, neglecting all the principal sources, Holy Scripture, Tradition, the Fathers, the Roman Liturgy, the teaching of councils and Popes, it is hard to see on what Dom Aelred bases his right to accuse the "liturgists" of not making much of a show in theology. I think that, limited to these two lowest "theological sources," Dom Aelred's essay would hardly be called "theological" at all by St. Thomas himself.

The theological subordination of the virtue of religion to the theological virtues is based on the fact that the theological virtues cannot but attain God immediately (*objectum quod*), whilst the virtue of religion attains God indirectly (*objectum cui*: a means, the exterior actions of the cult, being placed in between). Whether this distinction holds not only in abstract theology but also in applied theology or not, the fact is that here, too, the Liturgy cannot be identified with the

virtue of religion. For, though one may say that the sacraments are "means," one cannot deny that in the Christian sacraments God is attained immediately; Baptism, Confirmation, the Holy Eucharist, make us participate in the very life of the God-Man Himself. And here is a still deeper reason for the basic importance of the Liturgy. The whole supernatural structure of Christian life, theological virtues included, rests upon this basic fact that to be able to accomplish any supernatural actions at all man must first *be* supernatural: psychology comes after ontology, *operari sequitur esse*. To *be* supernatural is to share in Divine Life, and this communion in the Divine life which we call sanctifying grace lies embedded in the normal and necessary channels of this grace, and these channels are the Sacraments, principally the Eucharist.

The virtue of religion contains nothing but human actions which create a human facility of accomplishing the external cult rightly. The Liturgy is *all* that is implied in the normal, necessary and sacramental action in which both God and man join.

Dom Aelred rightly insists upon the distinction of the virtue of religion and the theological virtues. There is, he says, a difference in kind, not only of degree. But distinction should lead to union, not separation, or must I read "opposition"? One gathers the impression that they cannot be simultaneous. On the contrary: if they were in the same line the exercise of the one might for a moment suspend the exercise of the other (and this is what his treatment of the Liturgy insinuates). But if they are of a different kind they not only may but ought to co-exist, and be complementary. And this is what happens *de facto*. And here we come to a serious gap in Dom Aelred's reasoning. He seems to think that one can just "love." In concrete life there is nothing of the sort. The theological virtues can no more be exercised without the active exercise of other virtues than the soul can "live" without the body. The body, the bodily circumstances, conditions, etc., are at least the *condition sine qua non* of the soul's activity. As long as we are in this world our most spiritual actions can never completely discard the conditions of time and space. We can no more just "love" (as an action of the theological virtue) than we can just "be" without the framework of other actions and conditions. Nothing is more basically scholastic. When we love God it is *necessarily* in prayer (that is, in the active exercise of the virtue of religion) or in the active exercises of other virtues. We cannot "love" in the abstract, we cannot love in the air. And this is very important for now the question arises: if love is necessarily

linked up with such conditions, which conditions are the most favourable for the exercise of love? And the answer of all times is: in prayer, in the exercise of the virtue of religion. Other circumstances are not excluded: we say merely with the whole Christian tradition that the exercise of the virtue of religion is, normally, the most favourable condition for the practice of the theological virtue of love. And with this in mind we turn to the liturgical movement.

The "liturgists" desire only one thing, to renew all things in Christ: *instaurare omnia in Christo*. This can only be done by the love of Christ, the God-Man. They want therefore a Christian "conversio," change of heart. For, as Father Grou, S.J., says so pointedly: evil comes from the heart much more than from the mind. Now, since this love must be concrete, and since it cannot be exercised concretely without some other activity, reason, theology, feeling, devotion, imagination, sacraments, private and common prayer, we must find out which conditions are most favourable. This is not all. Who says Christian change of heart, means a change of heart modelled on Christ, a change of heart which brings about that kernel of all spiritual life: the likeness of Christ. In other words, a change of heart which is *objective* because Christ is something utterly concrete and objective. Therefore they rightly conclude that among the means or conditions for this *conversio* those must be stressed which are most objective, most full of Christ. These means are the divinely instituted Sacraments, the divinely inspired prayers and readings of Holy Scripture, and all the other elements which make up the Liturgy in the strict and more material sense of the word. It was with these means that Christ created the Church. The Church, says Johann Adam Möhler, is the prolongation of Christ. Her life is the prolongation of the Redeeming-Act of Christ. Therefore, the "liturgists" conclude, we must form our souls in the mould of the Church; there is no surer means of forming ourselves in the mould of Christ. So they began to stress participation in the sacraments, common prayer, in short, all those ways and means through which the Church, Christ, lives in us. They gave these means their due precedence over the subjective means: reason, feeling, imagination, even devotions and theology. For the essence of devotion as it is understood in the mind of the faithful is its subjective character. And even theology, in so far as human reason plays, *de facto*, a predominant rôle, is for a great part subjective.

Now, no "liturgist" ever *excluded* the subjective means. They know full well that the life of the human person is a

synthesis of the objective and the subjective. What they did and do fight is the supremacy of the subjective over the objective, and in this they have the whole Christian tradition, theology, philosophy and approved spirituality with them. It is here that the conflict lay whenever and wherever it arose. It was not love of the Blessed Sacrament, nor love of Our Lady and the Saints which was ever really in question, but merely the supreme subjectivism, individualism, which found its religious stronghold in the arbitrary and often "ill-judged devotions" of which Father Grou complains in his *School of Jesus Christ*, and Father Grou was not a "liturgist."

Here lies the fundamental objection which I have to Dom Aelred's treatment not only of prayer but of love at large. For his treatment is exclusively based on reason and the authority of a few, arbitrarily limited, texts of St. Thomas. Thus his whole treatment is basically subjective. The human person is seen and treated in the light of individualism. Yet it is a fundamental mistake, as Jacques Maritain pointed out in his Oxford lecture of last year, to confuse personality and individuality, the one being based on the spiritual element in man, the other on the material. Now I should like to put it to Dom Aelred that his love is reduced to mere theory. I explain. Love is essentially a going out of oneself, a going out towards the *object*. Love is, therefore, something essentially *objective*. It is precisely because it is objective, wholly "object-minded" if I may say so, that love achieves assimilation and union. What then is love in practice? It is complete surrender to the *object*, the sacrifice of the self in a super-human endeavour to achieve complete adaptation to the *object* in order to achieve complete likeness with the *object*. As Father Festugière pointed out in a brilliant review of F. Maréchal's *Psychologie des Mystiques*, the difference between Christianity and Hellenism is precisely that the latter is wholly preoccupied with wisdom, with the intellect, whilst the other is the reverse; it demands love and is love, and defines God as love and defines knowledge as the love of God and our fellow-men (1 Ep. of St. John). In other words, the difference between Christianity and the highest non-Christian mysticism (if mysticism) is that Christianity demands an absolute superiority of the objective over the subjective, because the objective is God and the subjective is the self. There is no suppression of the self and the subjective, but self-sacrificing purification and adaptation to the objective for the greater and truer exaltation of the human person. Instead of diminishing the human person this subjection of the subjective to the objective leads to the expansion of the human

personality, vertically towards God, horizontally by spreading itself over our fellow-men. This is the meaning of love. Now the objective, concrete God is, for us, revealed in Christ, in the Church and in creation at large. There is no other God but the One who became man, who united the whole divine nature to the whole human nature in one subsistence, the Personality of the Word Incarnate. If, therefore, we desire to love and at the same time neglect or underestimate the means through which the Object chose and daily chooses to come to us, in other words, if we attach no more than an institutional value to the structure of the Redeeming Act and the life of the Church, both manifested in the Liturgy, our love is a phantom, a theory. Love is not self-centred. It is essentially "objectivisation," if I may use such a word. In Dom Aelred's treatment of Christian love there is no mention of the Church in this respect, and the only chapter which speaks of Christ is, very characteristically, the last chapter entitled "The mind of Christ," not the Redeeming-Act. Whatsoever be the qualities of the book, this is, it seems to me, a fundamental flaw, a flaw caused by starting at the wrong end, and by starting with the wrong mentality. I return to the "liturgists."

When they tried to restore the love of Christ, that is when they tried to undertake a new "objectivisation" of the outlook of the average Catholic, they found that if people accused them of "lack of sympathy" with the subjective means, it was not the means themselves but their subjectiveness, their individualism they wanted to defend. No "liturgist" discards devotion, but any genuine "liturgist" will object to devotion being placed above the Christ-given Sacraments. I have personally experienced quite recently that many so-called practising Catholics clamoured for Benediction whilst they stayed away without any plausible reason from the Mass, which for them had no other reality than that of a Sunday duty. This dreadful state of affairs has made the "liturgists" think and study. They discovered that this supremacy of the subjective, of the individualistic, had become a principle, had formed a complete mentality. With the recent Popes they found that the whole Catholic outlook had become "subjectivised." Hence the resentment of the youth and their leakage; they resent this arbitrariness and this disintegrating supremacy of whims, imaginations and bourgeois emotions which go by the name of religion. Hence, too, that loss of the sense of the basic law of universal human solidarity which formed the main theme of the present Pope's Encyclical. Anything is better for the new generations than

this state of affairs, hence the success of any totalitarian doctrine, Communism or Nazism. The neglect of the Sacraments, the rise of modernism, the widespread apathy in face of universal social injustice, the resentment of authority, all is explained by this individualism. I should like to ask any objector to the Liturgy who fears for attacks on mysticism or on personality how much *genuine* mysticism and personality there is in this anti-liturgical outcry. Have we ever seriously examined the tremendous amount of intellectual hedonism, of bourgeois complacency which avoids trouble at all cost, of imagination and sheer religious feelings there is in all this defence of devotion and mysticism? True devotion and true mysticism are made of sterner stuff.

What, then, does the liturgical movement aim at? At nothing but a sincere, consistent and integral Catholic life. And its method is to restore the objective, normative value of Christ and His Church and all they contain. For this they use the objective means contained in the Liturgy. As long as the Our Father is a corporate prayer, even when recited by one, the "liturgists" will hold, with St. Cyprian and St. Leo, that Christ demanded corporate prayer. Dom Aelred's *boutade* that "common prayer, if not the opium of the people, is at least a species of intoxication" (p. 151) is, I am afraid, at best arrogant, at worst simply blasphemous when compared with Christ's words (Mt. xviii, 19—20). The appeal to modern psychology for this statement does not make things better. Freud is hardly the authority for a Catholic theologian to consult about Christian common prayer. May I suggest St. Augustine on the Psalms, or St. Hilary on the Psalms, or Father Grou, S.J., *The School of Jesus Christ* (p. 286—7)? As long as the Mass is the renewal of Christ's Redeeming-Act, and, as St. Thomas put it, the *sacramentum unitatis et pacis*, the "liturgists" will probably maintain that the Mass is the source and norm of Christian life. As long as the official common prayer of the Church, her ceremonies, her *cultus interior et exterior* are the Church's as such, they will maintain, with St. Teresa, its supremacy over any individual mystical grace. They never wanted the Liturgy to be the exclusive way or moment of the Christian supernatural life. They only want it to be the centre and the source, as long as sanctifying grace and theological virtues are infused in us at the *sacrament* of Baptism, the gifts of the Holy Ghost at the *sacrament* of Confirmation, the anticipation of final beatitude at the *sacrament* of the Eucharist. Lastly, as long as the first two commandments are the love of God and the love of our fellow-man, and as long as these commandments find their

supreme fulfilment in the celebration of the Sacrament of Love, they will see in the Liturgy the supreme expansion of human personality and reject as mere calumny the accusation of "impersonalism." There is no exclusiveness, anywhere, but there is a Christian re-orientation of the concrete life of Catholics, ourselves to start with.

Dom Aelred rightly says that Catholicism and individualism are incompatible. Let us hope that one day he will be a support to the "liturgists" and speak to us of the Love of God in such a way that this incompatibility is shown in his very treatment so that it may be carried out into practice. He certainly has the talents, but he needs more depth, more insight in the living Christian reality, more use of all the sources of theology, and—a thing so very helpful for wider and deeper understanding of the riddle of Christianity—more history. If such an enterprise were the result of what seems to me a regrettable incident, we shall all profit by it.

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

THE CULTURAL-ECCLESIASTICAL PROBLEM OF FINLAND

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The author of this article is a member of the Orthodox Church ; he is at present teaching at a high school of the Syrian Church in South India, though he has been in Finland and his wife is a native of that country. We have, however, abridged and, in certain places, summarised his work.

THE Lutheran President, Herra Kallio, recently claimed that Finland was defending "Western civilization and Christianity." We will only consider this as a recurring slogan in Finnish history. In their heraldry it is symbolised by the national emblem of a crowned Swedish lion flourishing a straight "western" sword, trampling on a curved "Asiatic" scimitar. The arms of the Eastern March of Karelia likewise show two smiting swords grasped by mailed fists, each of somewhat naïvely contrasted asiatic and mediaeval armour. On the other hand there is the "pucka" Finnish heraldic symbol of the bear, and the coincidence that the new national flag is a blue cross on white, the reverse of the Greek flag.¹

De jure, Orthodoxy is the established church in Finland, side by side with Lutheranism. Also the Swedish language has theoretically bilingual rights with Finnish ; but, in both cases, there is a gulf between theory and practice. The majority of Finns consider Swedish and Slavonic influence as the Scylla and Charybdis of their nation. Between these two conflicting antitheses lies a far more complex anti-Western strife than is associated with the Slavophil name in Russia. Finland has remained isolated from the main currents of European history and has also been unable to assimilate such foreign influences as have come to her. Even Sweden came without introducing genuine feudalism or pontifical supra-nationalism. By historical circumstances, Finland, a poor peasant country, subsequently failed to assimilate either the Versailles culture which played so important a rôle in the life of her Swedish masters or the gallic classicism of the Russian St. Petersburg period. Already in the eighteenth century Finland showed its resentment of things foreign, whether Swedish or the gallic vogues of the Swedish court. The change of masters to Russian overlordship in 1809 gave a further fillip to the quest for a national, indigenous *Urform*.

Throughout the Middle Ages, from 1155 onwards, Finland has suffered from a *Drang nach Osten* through the Baltic on the

¹ A suggested reference to Orthodoxy. The Orthodox are persistently miscalled "Greek-Catholics."

part of the Prussian Knights and the Swedish king. This was claimed as a crusade to convert the heathen Finns and Balto-Slavs. In 1240 and 1242 Swedes and Germans fell on the Free City of Novgorod. St. Alexander Nevsky stemmed this tide, and although weakened by their onslaught, he left, at the close of his life, the Republic of Novgorod as a European bulwark that saved Finland and the Baltic from the rising tide of Tartar *asiatic* invasion.

However the "crusades" continued to encroach on Finland. Chains of Swedish castles garrisoned the country. Viborg became a Hansa city. The Swedes installed an Englishman, St. Henry of Upsala, as Primate of Aabo; he was martyred by the Finns. A clash with Orthodoxy was inevitable. The earliest Christian remains in Finland are those left by Eastern missionaries.¹ Tradition even claims St. Andrew as preaching on the site of Valamo monastery. The latter was actually founded by the Greek saints Sergios and Germanos from Athos, and was an organized community by 960. Time after time the prowling advance guards of the *Drang nach Osten* fell upon the monastery. Thus in 1163 the danger was so great that the remains of the founders had to be translated to the Free City of Novgorod, and could not be reinterred until 1180. There is the curious story of the Swedish King Magnus Eriksson washed ashore from an invasion in 1371 and becoming the monk "Gregory"; his grave at Valamo is still shown to the pilgrim, and no other site exists. In 1578 and 1611 Valamo was twice razed to the ground by Swedish armies. In 1617 the Swedish conquests swept over Karelia and exterminated the shell of this temple of Orthodoxy. This pillaging recalls our English buccaneers under Queen Elizabeth working a like havoc with Spanish monasteries. But at the height of Swedish dogmatic Lutheranism, when all other beliefs, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, were proscribed, an Orthodox church was permitted in Stockholm, owing to the presence of Orthodox Karelian Finns in the Swedish ranks. Yet Sweden dragged the Finns into the 'Thirty Years' War; an ideological "No Popery!" crusade.

In 1807, at the Treaty of Tilsit, Napoleon "gave" Finland, then Swedish territory, to Tsar Alexander I. In claiming his new provinces Alexander had to wage war from 1808 against a Swedish-Finnish coalition, which was defeated in 1809.

¹ *En passant*, philology affords such interesting examples as the Finnish for "cross," *risti*, cf. *krest*, ecclesiastical Slavonic. Bishop, *piispa*, cf. *ἐπίσκοπος*—*Pappi*, cf. *παπας*—priest.

This war will be much in patriotic memory from 1939—40. We need not concern ourselves with the political issues, beyond remarking that in 1809 the Grand Duchy of Finland obtained from the Tsar its first Constitution and full Dominion status, united to the Russian Empire only in the person of the Emperor as Grand Duke of Finland. From this moment begins the ascendancy of Finnish over Swedish. The Tsar was enthroned in Borgaa Lutheran cathedral, in the presence of a chasubled protestant hierarchy. Let us consider the relevant ecclesiastical issue. Whatever may be alleged against Russian erastian interference with their subjects' Churches in Georgia, Armenia and Poland, whatever justifiable grievances the Finns have against Tsarist bureaucracy's sudden attempt to snatch back their original and long-established Dominion status (in the years immediately preceding the war 1914—18) the Finnish Lutherans have at no time any cause of complaint in the least comparable to that of the Irish. In 1829, over the Catholic Emancipation Act, George IV was protesting that "the only hope of protestants lay with their King," and that he would rather lay his head on the block than yield. Following Disraeli's "Public Worship Regulation Act" of 1874 Tractarian clergy were thrown into prison for their witness to Catholic tradition. But from 1809 the right of Finnish Lutherans, to be the Established Church of the majority in the duchy, was never challenged by the Russians. When the Tsar came to Helsingfors and saw a vast, imposing neo-classical cathedral¹ being reared conspicuously in the centre of the city, and learnt that it was destined for the Orthodox, relatively a small community there, he gave orders that it was to be handed over to the Lutherans, and instead the Orthodox were given a small, insignificant building² impeccably "western" and baroque in architecture, tucked away behind the cathedral. When the time came later to build a large Orthodox basilica³ it was erected on rocky waste land, at that time on the edge of Helsingfors. The most that can be said against the imperial authorities is that they discouraged protestant proselytism inside the Empire proper. But during Tsarist days the Lutherans were able to launch a protestant mission against Orthodox Karelia, the centenary of which has just been commemorated.

I have laboured this point for contrast with the inexplicable reactions and phobia against Orthodoxy instinctive to certain

¹ Protestant cathedral of St. Nicholas ; now to be known as the "Great Church" (since St. Nicholas is "Russian" and therefore *taboo*).

² That the *Kolminaisuus kirkko*, i.e., Trinity Church.

³ Dormition Basilica.

sections of the Finnish public: a people inherently phlegmatic, tolerant, canny, and yet stubborn. (By contrast, like the Catholic Irish, the Orthodox Karelians are vivacious and temperamental). It is incredible that there can be people naïve enough to identify Orthodoxy with Sovietism. Yet although only one per cent of the Finnish population is illiterate, not only do a majority of Finns think spontaneously and subconsciously in these confused terms, but even a distinguished Lutheran divine of Helsingfors University once made such insinuations in conversation with me. Some sinister underground connexion associating *Sobór* and *Soviet* is suspected under the mere term "Russ."

The Finnish antipathy to Catholicism and Orthodoxy is expressed as a resentment against things Swedish and Russian trespassing in *Suomi*. The man-in-the-street in Finland, as in Poland and the Baltic countries, thinks in politico-racial terms rather than in theologico-ecclesiastical categories. The Finnish Lutheran—Lutheran, "naturally," because he is Finnish—has lost enthusiasm for church-going and such old-fashioned causes.

This vicious circle has reacted unfavourably on the Orthodox Church. The ruling policy of the Finnish Archbishop has become to express Orthodoxy in terms of "new," "Finnish" modes, even when these be but a superficial echo of Hollywood vogues. Thus he has favoured clergy in mufti, moustached or "clean" shaven, the new kalendar, etc., as well as the use of the Finnish language liturgically. In consequence there has been a minor schism,¹ of the most conservative and Slavonic-minded, while Russian circles, remaining in allegiance to the state Church, have reacted by tightening the barriers round an exclusive Russian minority society, recruits for which have been provided by a steady influx of Russian refugees from U.S.S.R. Many parishes in Karelia have been "emancipated" from every external and linguistic Russian accretion. And the clergy of to-day have become quite ignorant of Church Slavonic and Russian—since its place is not taken by Greek or Rumanian the poverty of their reading may readily be imagined—while Finnish Karelian peasants visiting a town in west Finland will often find that Orthodoxy is only represented in a nominally Finnish parish by obviously

¹ It must be emphasized that even though there was chauvinistic and anti-clerical activity, monks being banished from the country for observing the Old Kalendar, etc., etc., in the years following 1918, yet this would give a most unjust picture if one does not recall that of recent years the State has done much to assist disestablished Old Style parishes to maintain churches of their own. The Finns are "Godly" and "God-fearing" in the best Protestant sense.

Russian *émigrés*. Other centres, such as the "junction" of Viborg, may have separate parishes: (a) Finnish rite; (b) Slavonian rite, and (c) Old Style Russian; both (a) and (b) being under the jurisdiction of the Primate of Finland, Mgr. Herman; (c) owing allegiance to Metropolitan Evlogi in Paris.

It would be hardly charitable, at the present critical juncture of Finland's struggle for existence and her hope of new solidarity with Scandinavia, to exhume old domestic quarrels, but it must be stated that post-1918 Finland had been rapidly moving towards a "splendid isolation" in which she was anxious to assert her distinction from Scandinavia. All her towns have been re-christened according to some mythological *Urform*. Individuals have hurried to change an honoured Swedish surname for a *pukka* Finnish translation. If they have not rushed to do this, in extreme cases they have lost their jobs. Although nobody could start an agitation against *Anglesey* or *Essex* in this country, *Sveaborg*, i.e., "Swedish castle," the historic fortress of Helsingfors, must now be officially designated "Suomese castle," *Suomenlinna*. University students have often been particularly spiteful in waging this vendetta. By reaction, Swedish-speaking Finlanders have rejected the term "Finn" altogether and described themselves as "Swedes" identified with the life of Sweden. Public notices in Finnish give no Esperanto-like hint; *station* becomes *asema*; *telegraf*—*lemmätin*; *telefon*—*pubelin*; *restaurang*—*ravintola*; and *café*—*kahvila*. Even *adieu* must be dropped from popular vocabulary since it is "Swedish"!

To my mind Roman Catholics failed to take these factors into consideration when they dispatched a Dutch Mission¹ to Finland, although there is a certain temperamental affinity between these two peoples. As far as I could judge, Roman Catholics, deeply rooted in their own security of a steady Gothic, Latin, mediaeval tradition, failed to recognize Finland's isolation from this ethos. Western Catholicism was introduced to Finland by a crusading, foreign, Swedish conquest. The Gothic-mediaeval mentality had no time to take roots before it was supplanted by *German* Lutheranism. (Orthodoxy and Catholicism might well point out that this pro-

¹ It is obviously only a temporary measure whether the Catholic clergy in Finland are Dutch or any other nationality other than Finnish. Surely the fact, admitted by the author, that there is a certain temperamental likeness between the people of Finland and Holland shows consideration on the part of the Roman authorities to local circumstances. It may be pointed out that the present Vicar Apostolic in Denmark is a Dane and a monk from a Benedictine Abbey where interest in all things pertaining to Scandinavia has been fostered for many years.—EDITOR.

testantism is "Teutonic" in contrast to their Œcumenical *Weltanschauung*). Appeal to St. Henry¹ was bound to be associated in the popular mind with a "foreign" past strongly unpopular in pre- (1939) war days. Also the Catholic Bishop was apt to be recalled, and so—to the best of my knowledge—he never became a Finnish citizen; this was hardly a good "advertisement." Finally both Orthodoxy and Catholicism should reject the temptation of being dragged into the *Sturm und Drang* of any alleged clash between "East" and "West." One of the author's most impressive memories is of Danish Roman Catholics in 1935 kneeling before the shrine of SS. Sergios and Germanos² in the crypt of Valamo Minster. There, in the Communion of the Saints, lies the synthesis for Finland's future.

VASILAIOS JAMES.

¹ Which is the dedication of the Roman Catholic church at Helsingfors, that at present serves as the cathedral for the Dutch Bishop of Finland.

² Pre-Schism saints.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Echos d'Orient.

Only one issue of *Echos d'Orient*—that for January—June, 1939, has come through to us, but it contains articles by most of the distinguished scholars who write for this organ of the French Institute of Byzantine Studies. V. Laurent, in *La Liste Episcopale du Synodicon de la Métropole d'Andrinople* brings the resources of his great learning to bear upon this venerable catalogue, so “useful for reconstructing episcopal succession in the bosom of the Byzantine Patriarchate.” Another article of his, *Evêche fantôme ou la Bitzina taurique*, is occupied with the lighter task of exploding the existence of a see which M. Bratianu in a recent book on the Shores of the Black Sea had claimed to have discovered.

A. P. Péchayre continues his account of the Episcopal Succession of Ochrida (the metropolitan see of Bulgaria), and the lively adventures of some of its bishops. Here he gives us more notes on Gabriel (1582—8), who went to Europe to seek alms and help, visiting Moscow and then Stephen Bathory, King of Poland, from whom he received letters of introduction to Sixtus V. On the way he stayed at Tübingen with Crusius, the Protestant historian, who was highly pleased to be able to question him on Eastern affairs, but found him uncommunicative on the subject of his destination and on that of religion (Crusius had been one of those who attempted a *rapprochement* between Lutheranism and Orthodoxy—an attempt which failed before the faith of the Patriarch of Constantinople). But Crusius was much intrigued by his guest, and wrote later to inquire about him, and heard, much to his chagrin, that he had made his submission at Rome. The itinerary is well worth recording.

From J. Gouillard we have an interesting study of a spiritual “common-place book,” compiled by a certain Abbot Isaiah in the thirteenth century. He describes the MSS. from a palaeological point of view, and then the actual content of these directions to a nun. Rigorist, replete with wearisome repetitions, unoriginal and hesychiast as they are, they are yet full of the Person of Jesus as centre of the spiritual life. “One is struck by the delight in speaking of ‘the very sweet Jesus’ even where one least expects it. . . . His friendship alone is allowed, he is the only Master, to him sins are confessed, he keeps the soul, it must be kept for him, he dwells in it. The activity of Theodora must be placed entirely in Jesus.” As to the value of the whole work, however, the writer con-

siders it "one of the worst productions of a literature where they are not lacking, but not without interest as an echo of the fervent monasticism of the time, heralding the spiritual renovation of the following centuries."

La Topographie de Constantinople byzantine is of interest to many besides archaeologists. R. Janin here gives a description (another article is to follow) of the discoveries made during the twenty years from 1918 to 1938. No city has perhaps suffered such a constant succession of sacking and looting, so many changes of territorial allegiance, as Constantinople. Archaeologists who have set themselves the task of reconstructing the ancient Byzantium have to dive beneath the destruction of the Crusaders or havoc dating as recently as 1912 and 1913. Yet results have been far from barren. In particular the layout of the hippodrome and imperial palace has been discovered and many of the ancient Christian churches—now, alas, mosques—have undergone careful examination. It is surprising to read that the great church of Santa Sophia is to be turned "*en musée d'antiquités byzantines*" but already the removal of much of the furniture placed there since it has become a mosque has led to remarkable discoveries, and many mosaics have been recovered.

In the article *Jérusalem entre Rome et Byzance*, Père Grumel sets out to discover the author of a hitherto unasccribed document published by Pavlov, and finds him in Nicholas III, Patriarch of Constantinople who is answering a letter from Symeon II of Jerusalem about 1089. Symeon seems to have consulted him about an approach from Pope Urban II, and while he was a champion of the azymes, he seems, with the wider experience given by knowledge of pilgrims in Jerusalem, to have been in some doubt as to whether to treat the question rather as a difference of rite. Père Grumel also contributes a review of Professor Zlatarski's second volume of the *History of the Bulgarian State in the Middle Ages*, and S. Salaville reviews a number of the more recent contributions to ancient Rumanian bibliography.

The *Chronique des Eglises Orientales*, written by J. Lacombe, contains among other things an account of the late Archbishop of Athens. As Mgr. Papadopoulos was well known in this country, a summing-up of his historical position, which seems to us just, may be quoted: "On ne peut cependant lui décerner l'épithète de grand historien, en raison de son peu d'originalité et des déficiences notoires de sa méthode critique; il montre d'autre part trop souvent une partialité par trop visible et il excelle à écarter les textes contraires à ses thèses. Son hostilité contre les catholiques n'était un mystère pour

personne et la loi contre le prosélytisme religieux fut nettement inspirée par lui. Il fut par contre un champion du rapprochement avec l'église anglicane, quoiqu'il ne semble pas avoir nourri beaucoup d'illusions sur le résultat final des réunions entre orthodoxes et protestants."

DOM RALPH RUSSELL and BR. AELRED WATKIN.

(As we go to Press the next issue July—December, 1939 has just arrived, we will review it in our October number.—EDITOR.)

Irénicon, 1939. Vol. XVI. Nos. 1—6.

This bi-monthly periodical continues—or continued to the end of 1939—amid the turmoil of war-torn Europe, its pacific way. Perhaps the most characteristic feature of *Irénicon* has been its well-balanced, broad-visioned survey of the ecumenical problem: *Irénicon* has never confined itself either to modern controversy or academic historical debates, medieval research or mere chronicle of the present state of the Eastern Churches. Thus in the numbers under review, Lot-Borodine writes on the balancing of mysticism and anthropology in Oriental Christian spirituality; Strotmann gives an account of a modern Russian Christian writer, Léon Chestov; two articles from the pen of Belmont pursue the insoluble enigma of Lukaris in the seventeenth century with his *pourparlers* with Rome and with the German protestants; G. Bardy produces a learned study of the Arian schism and its impact on the West. The reviewer considers particularly interesting to the unbiased seeker after a united Christendom the articles by D. O. Rousseau: "*Qu'est-ce qu'un Latin*," and by N. Arseniev: "*Justes du Vieux Moscou*"—a revelation of Christian goodness flourishing in certain souls under the old régime.

In addition to these outstanding articles there appears a section of the magazine regularly devoted to a current chronicle of religious affairs; country after country being taken up and the trend of opinion, of ecclesiastical policy, of religious development being delineated, explained and developed. Some 400 books on such subjects—all outstanding works in the year are included—are reviewed by competent critics, and issue by issue a list of books newly published is drawn up under subject headings, by means of which the busy student can keep in touch with developments of other scholars in his chosen field.

We end this short review with sad feelings : Belgium has been over-run once more and it will probably be years before we shall again have the happiness of regaining contact with our Benedictine brethren on the Meuse. Would that some message of sympathy could reach them in their trials. Until peace reigns again over Europe we pray God protect the monks of *Irénicon*. *Beati pacifici* . . .

DOM THOMAS RIGBY.

Orientalia Christiana Periodica. Commentarii de Re Orientali aetatis Christianae Sacra et Profana editi cura et opere Pontificii Instituti Orientalium Studiorum. Vol. V, No. I—II, III—IV. Rome, 1939.

As in former years, we wish to welcome with unstinted praise this volume of scholarly essays on Eastern ecclesiastical literature, edited by the Jesuit Fathers of the Papal Institute of Eastern Studies of Rome.

The main feature of this volume are the numerous monographs on Syriac literature by Fathers Ir. Hausherr (pp. 7—71, 525—526), G. de Jerphanion (pp. 207—222), and J. M. Vosté, O.P. (pp. 72—102, 368—406, 514—524). They should prove extremely helpful to scholars engaged in Syriac studies. The volume begins with an *In piam memoriam* of Pope Pius XI, whom the editor most fittingly wishes to commemorate as the *Papa Orientis Christiani* (pp. 5—6). Other *In memoriams* outline the life and labours of recently deceased scholars, whose work has contributed to enlarge our knowledge of the Christian East; H.R.H. Prince John-George of Saxony (pp. 235—238), Mr. Paul Collinet of Paris (pp. 238—241) and Nicholas von Baumgarten (pp. 527—529). The three necrological notes are followed by a list of the main writings produced by each author in the field of Oriental studies.

The Reviews of the most recent books—chiefly of an ecclesiastical and Eastern character—are usually written with a most commendable thoroughness. We may instance, for example, those of Fr. Ir. Hausherr on Dom Stolz's *Theologie der Mystik*, and of Fr. F. Tailliez on Canon Georgesco's *Une enquête sur l'Union des Eglises en Roumanie*, or again that of Mgr. Pietro Sfair on the Arabic Grammar written by Laura Veccia Vaglieri.

There are now a fair number of English scholars who have turned their attention to the Christian East, with its marvellous wealth of theological and historical literature, old and new. To these we recommend *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* as a veritable mine of first-class information.

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

Theological Studies. (New York). February—May, 1940.

This theological review is brought out by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus of the U.S.A.

We welcome such a review in the English language as filling a great need. Strictly speaking it is not our custom to deal with the reviews of 1940 until the following year, but we think that the work of giving to the public articles dealing with theology, explaining the Holy Scriptures and the Church's Tradition, and not merely dealing with Morals or questions of current interest, of very great importance in these days. In French, in German, there are excellent Catholic reviews, but in English they are yet to come.

The subjects dealt with in these first two numbers are, we hope, indicative of what is to follow! Father Burghardt's full discussion as to whether St. Ignatius of Antioch knew the Fourth Gospel is stimulating. He exposes the problem, surveys it in its historical bearings and then treats it critically, examining their affinity of thought, and applying this criticism to the texts of St. Ignatius on the Holy Eucharist, the Logos-Concept and the Holy Spirit.

There is a most interesting article by Father Ellard on "Alcuin and the Origin of some Favoured Votive Masses." We hope that Father Ellard will contribute in the future many articles on liturgical matters.

Also the "Bulletin on Religion and the One God" by the Editor and "Comments on the Sacrament of Orders and the Ecumenical Movement" by Father Haran are of value.

There are excellent summaries on "Current Theology" as well as book reviews.

We wish this review every success and hope that it gives prominence to theology derived from Patristic and Liturgical sources.

THE EDITOR.

NON-CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1939.

There is nothing in the January number which has any bearing on the Eastern Churches, but in the following numbers they receive considerable attention.

In the April issue Dr. Adolf Küry contributes an article of twenty pages entitled "Orthodoxe Zeugnisse über Schrift und Tradition." With the aid of sundry quotations from the Orthodox Catechisms and theologians he shows that the Orthodox Church rejects Rome's estimate of tradition and makes it subordinate to the authority of Scripture. We may be permitted to disagree with one of Dr. Küry's authorities.

For in one passage he quotes Prof. Balanos who declares that Rome teaches dogmas "which the Bible knows neither formally nor virtually," and gives the Immaculate Conception of Mary as one of these dogmas which depend exclusively on a later tradition, i.e., without any support from Scripture. Yet in fact we do base the proof of that particular doctrine on two texts of Scripture; those of Gen. iii, 15 and Luke i, 28.

A long chronicle of events taking place among the Oriental Churches is contributed by Dr. Berthold Spuler in this number. Judging by the list of magazines and newspapers consulted—variously printed in Greek, Russian, Rumanian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Arabic and Turkish—Dr. Spuler must be an authority on such matters.

The July issue contains an essay on "Die morgenländischen Kirchen und ihr Verhältnis zum Staate" by Dr. Spuler. In it he gives evidence of a change of front on the part of the Oriental governments towards their Christian subjects. This is largely due to the strong nationalist spirit shared by both Moslem and Christian members of the states concerned. Formerly the Europeans had to intercede with the Mohammedan governments on behalf of their Christian people; whereas now the Moslems favour them on their own accord and use them in their political missions to the European powers. Moreover this attitude is as pronounced in the independent countries of Iraq and Egypt as in other parts of the Near East where, it might be objected, European influence is employed.

To the foregoing must be excepted the case of the Armenian Christians who continue to be out of favour in most places where they live.

In the October number B. Spuler continues his interesting and well-informed chronicle of events.

DOM GILBERT SMITH.

Stephen Graham's News Letter about the Orthodox Churches in War Time. (March—May, 1940). 3s. per year.

This is a most valuable monthly production, small but we think enough to "keep open channels of communication" which is one of its chief objects.

The four paged letter consists of an editorial and then items of news from different Orthodox Churches. We gather some very interesting information about the new German Orthodox Church; not only are the Orthodox in Germany under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop Seraphim of Berlin, but the Orthodox Churches in Bohemia, Moravia and Slovakia, and also the Orthodox in the part of Poland seized by the Nazis

are under his rule, and we learn that he and his have been affiliated to the Synod of Sermasky-Karlovtcy. The editor seems to hope that the German-Soviet Pact in general will have an influence for the good of the Church in Russia. We too believe that religion will be restored in Russia, but not by the influence of Hitler.

In the May editorial an account of the *Bogomoltsi*, the Society of Those Who Pray among the Serbian Orthodox, is given. This Society of some five hundred thousand, whose groups are in every Serb town and in many villages, is under the guidance of Bishop Nicholas Velimirovic of Zhitcha; it is a very wonderful body of people and is certainly under the right leadership.

This gives some idea of the value of this publication. We will record some of its news items in our Chronicle of Events in the October issue.

THE EDITOR.

Heavenly Bread. (Chlep nebecny).

Heavenly Bread is a magazine which can be recommended not only to those who are interested in matters concerning the Russian Church but to all earnest students of Russian literature. The rather small numbers of those in this country who have a love for reading the beautiful Russian language in the original will, I think, agree that one of the great difficulties even after years of practice is to understand many of the allusions to religious customs and ceremonies which are part and parcel of Russian life and which are all taken for granted by classical writers as being all in the day's work. To illustrate my meaning one might take the case of a Hottentot unacquainted with our ways wondering what is meant by grace before a meal.

The fact is that Russian literature is simply honeycombed with this kind of thing and a magazine of this sort explains a great many of them. It is well got up; the print is good and so is the paper. These two points are of great importance to us who only know Russian from study.

The subject matter is very wide. There are homilies on the Gospel, sermons, explanation of feasts, notes on architecture, eikons, cathedrals, bells, etc. Biographies of certain celebrities of the East may interest some. One can also find lighter and not too "high-brow" reading in the way of short tales in the style of Chekhov which beguile a weary hour and are always edifying. Some light is also thrown on the state of Russia since the Bolshevik upheaval, whence it is clear that the country though oppressed and groaning

under the yoke of persecution has by no means altogether given up its belief in God. Instances are given where the pretended atheists have turned round in moments of danger or great crisis and have sent for a priest.

Last but not least one must mention the numerous lyrics which adorn these pages. There is always something wonderful in the cadences of Russian poetry, where the beautiful majestic sounds of many words ending in vowels are relieved by an occasional consonant which completely removes all ideas of weakness.

Not only the sounds but the ideas and sentiments are beautiful. We find in Russian poetry all that appeals to us in nature, in man and of his agonising soul appealing to his God to help his distracted and beloved country.

It is curious how the question of the calendar crops up from time to time. One cannot refrain from smiling when we are told that the Church will give up her birthright in giving up the calendar. One would have thought that the matter was one not for the Church but for the sun ; at least Pope Gregory thought so and so did the astronomer.

DOM MAURUS MOORAT.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

ON THE PERFORMANCE OF DIVINE OFFICE IN THE GREEK MONASTERIES OF CYPRUS.

The manner in which Divine Office is performed in Orthodox monasteries depends on whether a monastery follows the rule of Mount Athos, *i.e.* if it is *coenobitic* (κοινόβιον), enjoying communal life, or whether it is *idiorrhythmic* (ιδιόρρυθμον), having its own manner of life. In monasteries which are *coenobitic*, of which we have two in Cyprus, namely, the Troöditissa¹ in the diocese of Paphos and the Stavrovouni² in the diocese of Kition, Divine Office is performed daily in choir by all the monks.

In these two monasteries the monks are roused at 1 a.m. by a monk who goes round the monastery and knocks at the door of each cell. During the next hour the monks devote themselves to private prayer, and at 2 a.m. they are summoned by the same monk to attend at the church, where Mesonyktikon (Midnight Prayer) is then sung. This Office lasts for about an hour, and about 3 a.m. they sing Orthros (Morning Prayer) which is followed by the 1st, 3rd and 6th Hours and the Typikoi,³ and towards 6 a.m. the Divine Liturgy is sung, should it be a day appointed for its celebration. In the afternoon at 4 p.m. (5 p.m. in the summer) the 9th Hour is said and Hesperinos (Vespers) is then sung. After their evening meal, the monks assemble in the church at about 8 p.m. (9 p.m. in the summer) and sing the Office of Apodeipnon (Compline).

In the monasteries of Cyprus which are *idiorrhythmic* (monasteries of this category at Mount Athos, however, follow the same rule for the Divine Office as the monasteries which are *coenobitic*) it is customary for the monks to recite the Office of Mesonyktikon (Midnight Prayer), the Hours and the Office of Apodeipnon (Compline) privately in their cells. Sometimes, in certain monasteries, the priest and the deacon who are appointed to celebrate the Divine Liturgy recite the Office of Mesonyktikon in the church, and meanwhile the other monks slowly assemble in the church. At about 4 a.m. (5 a.m. in the winter) Orthros (Morning Prayer) is sung, and the Divine Liturgy follows, should it be a day appointed for its celebration. In the afternoon, at about 4 p.m. (5 p.m. in the summer), the 9th Hour is recited in the church and is followed by the Office of Hesperinos (Vespers).

¹ Dedicated to the All-Holy Theotokos.

² Dedicated to the Holy Cross.

³ Sometimes, only selections from this Office are recited.

At the monastery of Kykko¹ in the diocese of Kyrenia and at that of Makhaera² in the archiepiscopal diocese of Leukôsia, where there is a daily celebration of the Divine Liturgy, it is customary to recite the Office of Mesonyktikon (Midnight Prayer) in the Church before the Office of Orthros (Morning Prayer).

The appointment of priests and deacons for the performance of the Divine Liturgy and Office during the whole year is made at Easter time. Such appointments may be renewed for a second year. Two priests and deacons are appointed and the rest of the monks assist in singing the services. When a monk who is a priest wishes to communicate, then he celebrates the Divine Liturgy in the place of the appointed priest. At great festivals the Hegoumenos concelebrates with the archimandrite of the monastery together with two or three other monks who are priests.

*Feast of SS. Constantine and
Helena, the Great Monarchs.*

O. H. E. BURMESTER,
Paphos, Cyprus.

1940.

RUMANIA—AN ORTHODOX VIEW OF THE PAPACY.

Rumania is the country most open to a *rapprochement* with Rome, and to the many recent signs of goodwill towards the Holy See on the part of the Rumanian Orthodox Church is now added this commentary by the Bucarest daily *Universul*, on the Pope's Easter allocution:—

“For the Holy See, religious interests dominate everything. Everywhere the voice of Rome is listened to by millions of faithful, but however important to the Church political interests may be, they always yield place to the spiritual and moral preoccupations of the Christian world, which for centuries has been, and still is, the only true international community for its gigantic expansion and the powerful foundations of its pacific conquests. The Church's moral force only operates through peace. Hence the Pope's opinions and suggestions on right and justice, and the Roman Curia's activities in their diplomatic relations with different nations, cannot leave political observers and rulers of States indifferent. Their action is subtle, because their interests are universal; discreet, because it is free from temporal preoccupations; slow, but insistent, because the Church has eternity ahead; all directed towards peace, because her strength is purely

¹ Dedicated to the All-Holy Theotokos.

² Also dedicated to the All-Holy Theotokos.

spiritual. Hence the Vatican's diplomatic action cannot be defined in ordinary terms."

The journal then summarizes recent political events, and concludes :—

"This is in broad outline the aspect of the present policy of the century-old spiritual conflict, which seeks with invincible obstinacy to realize the Christian ethic, by bringing to the world a peace based on justice and true understanding among men." (From *The Tablet*, 20th April, 1940).

RUSSIA—RELIGIOUS REVIVAL.

Writing in *La Vie Intellectuelle*, Helen Iswolosky states the Godless League is realizing with something like dismay that Christianity is anything but dead in the U.S.S.R., and that the Church's influence is deeper than ever on the masses, particularly on the youth. Jaroslavsky, the chief of the Godless, has sounded the alarm by proposing new methods to reduce the thirty million believers which his statistics of May, 1938, revealed (400,000 of these are in Moscow).

Meanwhile the *Bezbojnik* and the *Antireligioznik* continue to throw interesting sidelights on religious life in Russia. For instance, these papers state that on Christmas Day in 1938, village children all over Russia observed the age-long custom of singing carols in front of every house, being everywhere welcomed with smiles and sweets. The authorities at once ordered new carols to be composed and taught in schools, exalting the birth of the Bolshevik régime, and in the course of the inquiry that followed it was revealed that in one village a "wandering" priest had trained the children in carol singing with the encouragement of the parents.

These "wandering popes," "Christ's infantry," as they are being called in the U.S.S.R., are proving a thorn in the Soviet's side, and are found in all the districts, where religion is stated to have been completely suppressed. In December, 1937, Jaroslavsky pointed out the danger of this widespread activity, and a description of these wonderful men was published in the *Bezbojnik* of April 21st, 1939 :—

"The 'wandering pope' carries the Church in his suitcase. He is dressed in ordinary workmen's clothes, but carries about his Mass vestments, chalice and eikon. He visits secret meetings of worship, distributes communion, performs wedding ceremonies, blesses baptismal water, which the parents keep for christening their babies in the 'pope's' absence, and after the meeting, visits the sick. He then wanders off to the next village."

The *Antireligioznik* No. 5, 1939, stated that baptisms administered by parents are particularly frequent in Ukraina.

"It so happens," continues the writer, "that the closing of churches and the dispersal of the local clergy have in many places only contributed to a far deeper revival of religious life than had ever been possible before. The same may be said about the suppression of convents and monasteries. Jswolosky has stated that the suppression of the monasteries has given rise to the far more dangerous institution of secret communities. Workers, labourers, students and undergraduates of technical schools, who to all appearances are indistinguishable from their comrades, are found in their private lives to observe monastic rules. One of these secret monasteries, founded by a Bishop and two monks, was only recently unearthed in Moscow. The existence of secret organizations for worship, the observance of religious practices by young people and children, the attraction exercised by the liturgy and sacred music on members of the Communist Party, are continually denounced by the Soviet Press, and examples of the religious revival might be multiplied.

"All the more powerless do the authorities feel themselves to stem this revival, as the clergy, who are at the bottom of it all, could not by any stretch of terms be denounced as anti-revolutionary priests, supporters of capitalism, enemies of the people, greedy of money and honour, or fit in to the picture drawn by anti-religious propaganda. Those priests who 'carry the Church in their suitcases' are absolutely destitute and live in the most precarious conditions. Their vestments are of the most primitive design, their chalices are of wood or tin; nothing differentiates them from the population; they work like the humblest labourers; they are members of the syndicates and often do social work of great utility; many of them are directors of sporting associations, reading circles and choral societies, which attract many youths belonging to Communist bodies."

In No. 14 of the *Bezbojnik*, Jaroslavsky candidly acknowledges that the believers unite with their piety a sincere eagerness for science and social progress, and that they do not represent a fanatical, retrogressive and anti-social element; he concludes that "It will take many a five-year plan to do away with religious prejudices."

Soviet townsmen are also stated no longer to adopt towards propagandists and militant atheists an attitude of respectful silence, but to show argument, whenever any pseudo-scientific premises fail to please them. Schoolmasters complain of the insidious objections that come from the children on

spiritual topics. Youth has ceased to allow itself to be convinced by leaflets and pamphlets on materialism.

What also makes anti-religious action difficult is that notwithstanding Russia's isolation from the rest of the world, it is known in the U.S.S.R. that Catholic workers' organisations represent a considerable force in the western world and a doctrine that comes under no suspicion of capitalistic tendencies. All these conditions are forcing the Soviet Government to alter its propaganda formulas and its anti-religious tactics. In a conference published in No. 1 of the *Antireligioznik* of 1939, and given by Ranovitch, Professor of History and Culture, there is a vigorous attack on the current theory that "Christianity is the religion of the exploiting classes, imposed on the people by force." He argues that if religion is an opium, Christianity is an opium which may contain an element of progress; that it has had a share of the greatest importance in the emancipation of slaves, by proclaiming the equality of all men, independently of social, racial or national origin, by endowing women with a new dignity, etc.

No. 4 (1939) of the *Antireligioznik* resumes the discussion by stating that it would be erroneous to put Christianity on the same footing as Capitalism, since big property did not exist among the primitive Christian communities, whilst slaves and the poor could claim membership and a right to leading positions. Christians in those days "showed no interest in property" and "access to the Kingdom of God was open to all the faithful." The paper concludes by admitting that religion does exercise a beneficent influence on the family by enforcing monogamy, "a progressive form" in the evolution of matrimony.

Moreover the *Antireligioznik* now freely discusses the Christian West, persecutions in other countries, and Christian syndicates, emphasizing that an alliance between Christianity and Communism is not possible, because Christianity upholds a doctrine of love that cannot be reconciled with the claims of class war. The paper, however, remarks that Communists are ready to take into consideration the fact that "the peace and brotherhood advocated by Christianity correspond to the ideas and aspirations of many workers"; adding that Communism can no longer ignore a force like the Christian syndicates, which number millions of members.

As regards the "internal front," the same paper admits that the Godless League has made mistakes, and that the attitude towards Christianity in general and the Russian Church in particular will need profound modifications; and it recalls the recent statement by persons in authority to the

effect that "the introduction of Christianity into Russia was a positive phenomenon in the history of the country." (From *The Tablet*, June 15th, 1940).

WHAT IS THE IONA COMMUNITY?

This is the title given to the fourth issue of *The Coracle* (May, 1940) and it is of remarkable interest.

The Rev. George MacLeod describes the Community as "A Brotherhood of men within the Church of Scotland seeking to find the implications of the Kingdom of God for modern society. During the summer months they worship, work and live together on Iona, rebuilding the ruined Abbey on a co-operative basis. Half the Brotherhood are young clergy pledged to work for two years in the difficult places of the cities (after three months in Iona), emphasizing the place of the Church in the New Community that is emerging in the world. The other half are skilled artisans who desire to express their labour as a ministry within the Priesthood of all Believers and create—in the building—a microcosmic witness of how labouring is transformed when seen as a Sacrament. The Brotherhood is based on Reformation principles. Several members of the Community are married. At present the artisans return to the ordinary labour market in the winter time." Yet in spite of Reformation principles this revival of vital Christianity in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland is based on the monastic life. It is so founded in order to meet the needs of the vast new housing schemes with its problem of Fellowship, together with the re-asserting of the lay witness in the Church and the demand for corporate worship.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE PLATONIC TRADITION AND THE LITURGY.

DEAR SIR,

I have read with great interest the article of Dom Bede Griffiths and the subsequent one of Father Crighton. In passing I should like the question of whether St. John of the Cross was a Christian Platonist gone into more fully; St. John was certainly well versed in the theology of St. Thomas.

Father Crighton in his article traces the platonic influence in the West beginning with St. Augustine, the *fons et origo*, through St. Gregory, St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure, and the Franciscans, to Suarez, Molina and the Jesuits with their exercises of St. Ignatius and popular devotions. He also says that the emphasis placed on the will led to an unduly moralistic view of Christianity and that "the free movement of the spirit enriched with grace and by its inner strength able to vanquish evil, this is a concept that does not appear very clearly in the platonic tradition."

I must say that I am puzzled. I will endeavour to make myself understood. I am going to treat Platonism as it shows itself in the tradition of the Christian East and among the Orthodox. In order then to be as concise as the matter allows I will take Father Hausherr's article "Great currents of Eastern Spirituality" (see *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*, July and October, 1937). The first section "Primitive Spirituality" need not detain us at present; we can then commence with the second, "Intellectualist Spirituality," here beginning (as does Dom Bede Griffiths) with Clement of Alexandria and Origen. He traces the Platonic tradition of the Eastern Church, St. Basil, Evagrius Ponticus, St. Maximus, etc. Intellect and contemplation predominate but intellect is not taken in the same sense as with St. Thomas, because these Easterns held the intellect to be essentially intuitive—on condition that, freed from passions ("*apathia*"), it could spontaneously exercise its own activity.

We then come to what Father Hausherr calls the "School of Sentiment or of Supernatural Consciousness," of which, he says, Diadochus, Macarius, and Symeon the New Theologian were the great exponents, especially the last mentioned who has built up a whole theological system on the necessity of supernatural consciousness. There seems definite authority (see *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire*, by J. M. Hussey) that Symeon was especially influenced by St. Maximus and through him by Evagrius and Origen. At any rate, Symeon's own description of the vision of God can hardly

be called imaginative in spite of Father Hausherr: "The virtue of the Holy Spirit shall suddenly come upon you, appearing not in the likeness of fire which can be perceived by the sense . . . but in the likeness of light, which shall open the mind, with all peace and joyfulness of soul, thus, that you may comprehend, it shall appear to you—that which is the beginning of that eternal first light and the splendour and glory of everlasting happiness—and, while this light is shining, all restless and unquiet thoughts shall disappear, and every movement that might disturb the soul vanish, every evil of the body be healed. Then the eyes of the heart are purged, and they see God as it is written in the beatitudes. Then, as in a mirror, the soul sees its errors, and is cast into an abyss of humility, and, having perceived the greatness of the glory, is filled with all joy and satisfaction, and amazed at the miracle which is beyond expectation, sheds an abundance of tears. And thus the whole man is changed, and knows God, and is known by Him." (P.G. cxx, cols. 432 AB Or. 23—quoted in the above). Now though Father Hausherr maintains that there is a cross current, so to speak, and an anti-Origen, anti-Evagrius movement with Barsanuphius, St. Dorotheus and St. Theodore the Studite as leaders, I am inclined to think it is more a matter of degree, or perhaps of an individual emphasis (*e.g.*, the coenobite *versus* the hermit) than any radical difference of spiritual outlook when the full import of *intellectual intuition* is taken into consideration. And so after a seemingly barren (though very little studied) period of three hundred years (from the middle of the eleventh to the fourteenth century) we come to the "Hesychast Spirituality" which definitely follows in the footsteps of St. Maximus and Symeon the New Theologian, and so even to the recent Russian Orthodox Saint Seraphim of Sarov (1759—1833). Throughout this tradition there is the same aim at *apathia* and the final *theosis*; there is the stress on the intellect (as explained above) and contemplation, but there is no special stress on the *will* as Father Crighton considers the outcome of Christian Platonism in the West, and I do not think (though this would demand a special thesis) there has been any general tendency to live divorced from the sacramental and liturgical outlook on life.

Are there then two types of Christian Platonism? Can it be said that St. Augustine is the great dividing line between the "Eastern" and "Western" traditions, or is there perhaps a double tradition in the West, St. Gregory and St. Anselm holding nearer to what has been termed "Eastern" while St. Bernard and St. Bonaventure developing the importance of

the will and so paving the way for individual devotionism which the Jesuits have accentuated?

Yours etc.,

K.F.E.W.

THE INFLUENCE OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY IN THE EAST.

The two letters on this subject (those of Clericus and Veritas) have referred to facts that unfortunately cannot be contradicted outright, though there may often be mitigating circumstances that need to be carefully gone into before sweeping statements are made; for instance, it might be noted that all Armenians use certain Latin externals and not only the Catholics, and that it is the *usual* Eastern practice for only the celibate clergy to attain the higher offices in the Church.

But when all the different circumstances—the national local historical backgrounds, the inferiority complex of Oriental Catholics, the interference on the part of Latin clergy, etc.—have been considered, a change for the better, however slow, is to be discerned and this is really the work of the Roman authorities, which only shows how careful we should be to make a distinction between the real Roman view on a question and that of the local Latin application (or want of application on account of local complications, etc.) of these views.

Yet while agreeing that very much has still to be done in carrying out the mind of the recent Popes in this matter of the Oriental Catholics regaining their own real Catholic and Eastern Traditions, especially as regards the training of their clergy, there is surely a quite legitimate sense in which the East can and should be influenced by the West, a very good example of which is shown in the account of the Armenian Mekhitarist Benedictines in our last issue. The harm does not seem merely the question of Western influence on Eastern Catholics—this is bound to happen, in fact there should be a mutual influence of East and West—but that more often than not the Eastern Catholics are brought into contact with the worst side of Latin Catholicism, that which is the result of years of individualism in mental outlook, piety and art. Before we can therefore criticise our Eastern Catholic brethren too severely we need to get to work and reform ourselves.

On the other hand, just as in the West underneath much that appears superficial spirituality and is indeed appalling art there is a wealth of true and living tradition among the

peasantry of Europe, so too among many of the older groups of Eastern Catholics underneath a veneer of a Latin or French exterior there is much that speaks of a real and ancient Eastern tradition. What often to an outsider seems merely a Latin innovation is in reality a time-honoured local custom. Such local customs are often to be met with among the Orthodox also—national history accounts for much. What is indeed a great desideratum among the Catholic Oriental clergy of all rites is a traditional and patristic formation together with a scientific study of their own Liturgies and a real knowledge of the fairly recent writings and thought of their Orthodox neighbours (especially in the case of works in Russian, Greek and Rumanian).

The real work of the mutual relation between Catholics of the West and the East (to say nothing here of the Orthodox or the Anglicans), in the line of thought at least, is for both sides to study the great common patristic tradition in theology, liturgy, spirituality and even canon law of the period before the Schism with the help that modern science and Western learning has brought to these questions, and from this to go on to the growth of tradition both in the East and the West. Much of course has been and is already being done on these lines, but much more should be done and it will doubtless be undertaken as part of the present Liturgical and patristic revival in the Church.

This is not written with the intention of closing this particular correspondence, but only to direct and deepen it.

THE EDITOR.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Holy Moscow. Nicholas Arseniev. (S.P.C.K.) 4s. 6d.

Religion in Russia. Edited by Count George Bennigsen. (Burns, Oates & Washbourne). 4s. 6d.

We are reviewing these two books together not in order to contrast them but because they are in certain ways complementary to one another. They both set out to deal with the religion of Russia; the first deals principally with the nineteenth century and is written by an Orthodox and a member of one of those old Moscow families that he describes; the other is a collection of papers read at Cambridge by Catholics, two of whom at any rate are working among Russians, and dealing largely with the present problem of Russia and the Catholic Church.

Professor Arseniev's book is, to our mind, one of very great value in gauging the vitality of the religious life that is still in Russia, and we think that much of what the professor sets out to describe in these pages has gone to make the martyrs and confessors of the Russian Church of the present day which will in the long run lead to its victory.

This book can perhaps be divided into two parts: the chapters dealing with Moscow as a religious centre with its churches, its liturgical life and its "types of righteousness"; and then the chapters dealing with Moscow society. But even when we have so divided it, we find that they intermingle; the religious spirit pervades the whole.

In the chapter on Moscow society we get a picture of where the beginnings of the religious philosophy of the Russian ascetic and mystic life of the nineteenth century had their origin—in the world of high culture and cosy social life to be found in the houses of her side streets. Here in these old family houses gathered young students, artists, poets and philosophers; here were discussed the advantages of the Eastern and Western culture, the reforms of Peter the Great, old Russia, Western feudalism, the Papacy, the new Western philosophy and literature, the œcumenical councils and the Fathers of the Church.

In order to get the complementary value of the two books we now will turn to the collection of Cambridge papers and then invoke Professor Arseniev's assistance and so get a fairly complete view of Religion in Russia.

Father Ryder contributes two papers to the collection: "Religion in U.S.S.R. To-day" and "The Church's Mission to Russia." In the first he shows up the double faced policy of Soviet Russia and, documenting his argument from the Soviet press itself, he shows that there are two kinds of

publications, one for export, the other for home use, and to these he refers and also quotes, leaving us to form our own conclusions. Sometimes one feels he might have made a clearer and stronger case against the U.S.S.R., but the general thesis is excellent and well worth studying.

Father Ryder's other paper is a defence of the policy of the late pope, Pius XI, who insisted that all those working for the "Russian Mission" should belong to the Byzantine rite. But in pleading this theme, Father Ryder is not the only advocate; two other papers bear directly on the subject, that of Father Mailleux and that of Mr. Donald Attwater. Father Mailleux gives us a very important sketch on "The Catholic Church in Russia and the Exarch Feodorov." The importance of Feodorov cannot be over-estimated; his success was this: "Before 1914 it could plausibly be argued that, in consequence of certain regrettable events of history, Catholicism was something foreign to Russia, and that the Catholic Church in Russia was a foreign Church. Since Leonidas Feodorov's life, work, sufferings and death for Russia, this view can no longer be advanced in good faith." In his person is summed up the whole of the Church's future apostolate to Russia. We would like to see a good biography of this holy man brought out.

Mr. Attwater read a paper on "Russian Spirituality and the Problem of Reunion." This is a plea, as is Father Ryder's paper, though in a more general and wider sense, for the importance of the Byzantine rite in the Church's approach to the Christians of the Orthodox Churches in regard to the problem of reunion. But here (as also with Father Ryder), the term Byzantine rite is used in the largest possible sense meaning spiritual culture, a Christian outlook, a mentality, and the same argument would be used of other Eastern rites for the Church's dealings with the Lesser Dissident Eastern Churches. Indeed the argument has been pushed further by Mr. Attwater even to the Church's dealings with the non-Catholic Englishman, and there seems to be very much to be said in favour of such a thesis. The longest paper, however, in this volume is entitled "Modern Russian Theology, Reunion and the Liturgical Movement in the Catholic Church," by Dom Theodore Wesseling. This article contains some very important truths concerning the attitude of Catholics to the Orthodox; truths that are not always borne in mind by those engaged in reunion work. Dom Wesseling stresses the *particularism* of the Byzantine mentality as an historical fact which must still be taken into consideration, yet this, he says, is not particularly Eastern, nor Greek, nor Russian,

but the result of the wholly artificial society of Byzantium. It was this spirit and the influence of the Emperor's cult that was responsible for starting and maintaining the Schism. From which, he holds that to deal with this schismatic mentality is a psychological and not a theological problem. He then comes to Modern Russian Theology and here we think a comparison with Arseniev's *Holy Moscow* will be useful. In dealing with this Russian theological school Dom Wesseling confines himself almost exclusively to Alexei Khomiakov and Father Sergius Bulgakov (quite rightly, since his space is limited). Speaking of their positive assertions, e.g., the Church as a living organism, having an interior unity based on the universality of Redemption, a unity of love and of spiritual freedom, the Church as a Christ-moulded society, these ideas, he says, the Slavophiles took from German Romanticism, arguing that Khomiakov, in breaking away from what Mgr. d'Herbigny has called "the pseudo-scholasticism of the Orthodox seminaries—nothing but a Latin handbook, dry and unintelligible"—went in reality to Catholic sources for inspiration, since this movement of German Romanticism was originated by Catholics, Görres, Schlegel and Möhler. From this he draws the conclusion "that there is not in the Orthodox Church a really living system of theology which has developed on its own, on normal lines, and thus has produced something vitally traditional which the Catholic Church has lost." It should be remembered that he is only speaking of the Russian Church and that he is not concerned with either ascetical or hagiographical or liturgical writings, but only strictly with theology.

Now here, in part at least, Professor Arseniev would agree, for he twice links Khomiakov with Möhler, yet he dissociates Khomiakov from what he calls "a sort of 'pantheistic' transfiguration and idealization of the organic after the model of romantic philosophy."

There are one or two other important points made in *Holy Moscow* that should be borne in mind alongside Dom Wesseling's thesis. First it shows the profound knowledge of the Greek Fathers that many of the Slavophiles had, e.g., Khomiakov himself, and the two Trubetskoi, Prince Sergius and Prince Eugen, to say nothing of Vladimir Soloviev. It shows specially how Sergius Trubetskoi, a great Greek scholar, was the proclaimer of the Divine Logos in Russian thought, though this was a common trend among them all. It is also important to note that Arseniev, while admiring Soloviev, is quite emphatic that his teaching on the "Sophia," and in these features of his cosmic mysticism, is alien to the

Christian Church of both East and West. Likewise he speaks of Father Sergius Bulgakov coming strongly under the influence of the half-gnostic Sophia-doctrine of Soloviev, yet he says of him that he is a great Christian thinker and a deeply devoted son of his Church.

We would venture now to posit the problem of the Church's approach to Russian Religion thus. That the Christian and Orthodox Faith is still in the heart of the Russian people, even in the U.S.S.R., seems certain, both from what these two books have to tell us and from many other sources of information. That the strength of the martyrs and confessors in Russia comes, apart from God's grace, from the tradition that Professor Arseniev sets forth in his book. Mr. Attwater says, "the extremest innovations among the Orthodox are generally exaggerations of elements found in Catholicism," and it may well be that *Sobornost* is a case in point. Dom Wesseling has helped to disentangle the problem by showing that it is primarily a question of psychology and not of theology, and by raising the method of approach to a Liturgical level, *i.e.*, viewing it in the light of Christ's Redeeming Act. His treatment, also, of authority with its mark of "sacramentality" and its "organic" character is specially to be noted.

This is all to the good, yet we hold that the problem cannot be fully solved unless Catholics study carefully and make their own what may be termed the "Russian religious mentality." There is much in the papers read at Cambridge to show that Catholics are aware of this, and Professor Arseniev shows its importance since he devotes a chapter to Ivan Kireyevsky who, with his wife, collaborated with the monks of Optino in editing the writings of the ascetic-mystic Fathers of the Eastern Church. Among other works they translated those of Dorotheos, Isaac the Syrian, Macarius of Egypt, John Climacus, and Maximus the Confessor. This should be considered with the doctrine of the Logos as exposed in St. Justin and St. Clement of Alexandria, which developed into what may be called a "religious philosophy." The combination of this religious thought, together with Gregory Palamas and Jacob Boehme needs very little exaggeration to produce Father Bulgakov's "Sophiology" in which he covers nearly the whole field of theology. All this needs to be considered in the light of the Liturgy and so sifted.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

Eusebius Matthopoulos, Founder of *Zoe*. By Seraphim Papakosta. (S.P.C.K., 1939). pp. xvi, 107. 2s. 6d.

The influence and importance of Eusebius Matthopoulos (1849—1929) in the life of Orthodox Greece cannot be over-emphasised. One is thankful for this biography even though one would like it to be less hagiographical in style.

Drawn to monastic life from his adolescence, intellectually gifted, ascetic though always of poor health, Eusebius met in his youth one of the remarkable priests of the epoch, Ignatius Lampropoulos, an energetic preacher and spiritual director of many. This left its mark on the young man. His studies once achieved, he took part in the publishing of a religious review and undertook a bold campaign against simoniac bishops—a sad vestige of the Turkish dominion. This brought upon him persecution and exile. Eusebius did not allow his friends to intervene, and bore his sufferings in greatest humility. It became obvious to the authorities that here was, not a rebel, but a righteous man. After six years of retirement and prohibition of preaching Eusebius and his fellow-exiles were justified by the synod. Meanwhile, the cause which they defended was also revised and the government took measures against every possibility of simony. From this period onwards Fr. Eusebius, enriched by his sufferings, came out as a preacher and soon gathered round him a body of enthusiastic young clergy and laity. Two leading motives distinguished his activities: he had the highest idea of the "ministry of the Word" and he advocated frequent communion. He went through all the country preaching everywhere and gathering crowds. He undertook the publishing of a periodical *Zoe*—which later on gave its name to the whole movement. He called his listeners to repentance, to deeper knowledge of the Bible. He trained clergy and laity ready to carry out the preaching. Once more, his orthodoxy was suspected and once more vindicated. Those who worked with him point out that he never realised that he was their leader and inspirer. A quality of "hidden life" remained in him all through his public activities. Besides many short essays he left a book *The Destiny of Man*, a product of his deep spiritual experience and knowledge of men revealed to him as spiritual director. Death has not stopped the work of Fr. Eusebius. His followers continued the activities of the lay-brotherhood *Zoe*. Professor Bratsiotis gives in the preface of the book the account of its present activities. One would like this part of it to be longer.

NADEJDA GORODETSKY.

La Congrégation de S. Hormisdas et l'Eglise Chaldéenne dans la Première Moitié du XIXe Siècle. P. Stéphane Bello, moine chaldéen. (*Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 122). pp. xii 250. 50 lire.

Father Bello has traced in its historical setting the life of Gabriel Danbo, restorer of monasticism in the Chaldean Church and founder of the Congregation of St. Hormisdas.

Chaldean affairs at the close of the eighteenth century were much involved, and, moreover, communications with the Holy See were beset with difficulties complicated by the events of the Napoleonic wars. The author's aim is to unravel the tangle by setting out historical facts in a scientific manner. Having access to unpublished documents he claims to give a fuller account than has hitherto appeared, with important corrections.

A marked feature of this Congregation of St. Hormisdas is the varied character of its work, allowing as it does for active, as well as contemplative life, in order to meet the needs of the Church. Father Bello depicts the zealous and fruitful apostolate of Gabriel Danbo and his monks among the Nestorians. By the law of Simon Basidi (1450) the Chaldean Patriarchate had been hereditary in the sense that succession was restricted to members of one family. We learn how the monks effected the creation of a new hierarchy, based on the right of election, and how they worked to re-establish celibacy of the secular clergy. The community of Rabban Hormizd glories in staunch defence of the Catholic faith and loyal support of the Holy See.

The monograph is fully annotated and well documented.

P.I.

Byzantine Art in Roumania. By Marcu Beza. pp. 106. Frontispiece and 47 plates, some in colour. 1940. (Batsford). 21s.

Though the beginnings of scientific Byzantine studies only date back within living memory, the picture of Byzantine culture in general and art in particular is already being filled out by studies of its provincial manifestations. Such studies often owe their origin to the growing national and historical consciousness of the Balkan countries. It is a study worth undertaking, for, although such Byzantine art in Roumania as is represented in this volume is very definitely a late and provincial variation, sometimes rather clumsily handled, it is not at all without interest nor without artistic merit of a secondary character. However, the title of the book is

misleading, being, as the author himself says : " too widely comprehensive." He states in the Preface : " I shall treat the subject solely in the light of a number of ecclesiastical objects, hitherto unknown, which I discovered in various monasteries, libraries and museums of the Eastern Orthodox countries, from Mount Sinai to the Highlands of Thessaly, and from Alexandria through the Aegean Isles to Istambul." It would have been better if the book had been given a more accurately descriptive title, for those who look for a general survey will not find it, yet to state this fact is by no means to depreciate the book.

It consists almost exclusively of illustrations ; a series of fine monochrome plates, as we might expect from Messrs. Batsford, and a number of much less good colour-plates. Far the greater number of examples are late, as Byzantine art goes, dating from the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The objects illustrated are divided into six groups : (I) Altar crosses and holy-water vessels. (II) Liturgical fans. (III) Eikons and portraits (some interesting, stiff portraits of local nobility in their elaborate dress. The usual process is discernible by which the *donor* first appears in a corner, but gradually usurps more and more of the picture until he has complete possession). (IV) Reliquaries and caskets (some of the most attractive specimens). (V) Embroideries (No. 23, called—in the notes, under the photograph and in the index—a *chasuble*, is surely *stole-ends*. It exactly corresponds with the numerous other photographs of stoles). (VI) Gospels and gospel-covers. (There are one or two fine miniatures and the naïve scenes of daily life from Prince Matthew Bassarab's Second Gospel, 1643, are interesting. Princess Helen's Gospel-cover, 1551, No. 33, is perhaps the finest thing in the book, and No. 41, with strong Renaissance influence, is also noteworthy).

The thesis of the brief introductory letter-press—no more than three pages, followed by individual notes on the illustrations—is that after the fall of Constantinople the patronage and support of the Orthodox Church, its monasteries and its art passed to the Roumanian princes. Many of the objects illustrated demonstrate their bounty to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem, in whose treasury they now are. (There is also a coloured photograph of the Archimandrite Kyriacos, the Keeper of the treasury.

The English is not throughout quite the native tongue—we find such phrases as : " To the good-heartedness of the latter would come from time to time a humbly requesting message. . . ." *Silver gilt* is so usual a technical term that

gilt silver (No. 5) has an awkward sound. There is no indication of whether the book is a translation of the Roumanian edition or re-written by the author in English.

In a letter to the author, who is the Roumanian Consul-General in Jerusalem, the Anglican bishop in Jerusalem praises the book as a contribution towards "a mutual understanding by the laities of the two churches of each other's art and worship and devotion." The bishop says that the Roumanian edition "has provided me with a knowledge of Byzantine history and art which I never possessed before." It is to be hoped that the Roumanian edition contained more than the present brief and not very learned letter-press.

E. J. B. FRY.

Leontiev. By Nicolas Berdyaev. (Geoffrey Bles: The Centenary Press). pp. 229. 10s. 6d.

This is a study of an extraordinary personality and a unique Russian, one who preferred the Greeks and the Turks to the Balkan Slavs, who was neither Slavophil nor "Western," yet who loved old European culture, who was a universalist as well as an aesthete. There was something of a Walter Pater about Constantine Leontiev's pagan outlook on life and yet he had the Russian ascetic's view of his personal salvation.

There is an added interest in this study since the author owns that he is in disagreement with the substance of Leontiev's religious and social philosophy and yet he can see in him "one of the noblest and most moving figures in Russian spiritual life."

Leontiev was a lone man with a will to power, with which he would have used the Russia of his ideal allied with the East to stave off the downfall of the modern democratic and fast becoming socialised Europe. This was but a short lived dream. But apart from his social interests and more important than them in considering his character is the fact that he was a romantic. "Romanticism was an entirely Western phenomenon of Catholic and Protestant origin, and completely alien to the Orthodox East. Similarly, Russians were almost strangers to the cult of love which Leontiev had revived. His thought, too, was Latin in its precision and clarity; there was nothing vague or vapid in his writing." So much for a summary of him as a writer. This explains in some measure his isolation. Again, unlike the older Slavophiles, who lived simple and respectable domestic lives, he was a libertine which his stay in Greece and Constantinople tended

to accentuate. Yet it was at Salonika that there came to him his religious crisis, the act of grace of his conversion, when he promised Our Lady that he would don the monastic habit.

He went to Mount Athos for almost a year "in order to learn to become a true Orthodox Christian." There the Elders (starets) deemed him not yet ready for monastic life. Some years elapsed before he settled at the Optina Monastery and in August 1891 he took secret vows in the name of Clement. Then in the November of the same year he died of pneumonia at the Sergeievsky monastery.

Leontiev then stood for an Orthodoxy that was not essentially Russian but Byzantine in character, monastic and ascetic in outlook, authoritative and hierarchical in structure. Just as for Soloviev Rome was the centre of the Church Universal so for Leontiev it was Byzantium—but he did stand for a Universal Church and not for the Church nationalism of the Slavophiles and Dostoevsky. He saw no originality in Russian Orthodoxy—"All our Saints were only the disciples, the imitators and the followers of Byzantine Saints"—and we cannot help thinking that the roots even of St. Seraphim's holiness were deep in the Byzantine tradition in spite of Mr. Berdyaev's statement to the contrary. Leontiev had doubts about the authenticity of Khomyakov's Orthodoxy. For him the Metropolitan Philaret was the true type of Orthodox thinker. On the other hand Leontiev seems never to have passed beyond a certain fear and pessimism in the service of God and the Church in spite of his aesthetic love of the Liturgy.

But Leontiev was more than a very complex *brain*; he was in very deed a prophet. He defined the very character of the Russian Revolution some thirty-five years before it materialized. He had these terrifying words to say about the coming crisis: "Russian society, which is already equalitarian in its customs, will be dragged more rapidly than other societies along the fatal road of general confusion. And who knows but that, like the Jews who unexpectedly gave birth to the teacher of a new faith, we too shall unexpectedly give rise to Antichrist—sprung from the bowels of our political system, which will first of all abolish class distinctions, and then all vestiges of an ecclesiastical principle."

This is indeed a book to read; it throws a new light on the Russian problem, and it can be very valuably compared with the author's book on Dostoevsky.

B.W.

The Evolution of Peace. By G.C. (Stormont Murray, High Wycombe). 6d.

This pamphlet, so outspoken in its truth-telling that it may give offence to some, is written by an anonymous Catholic priest; its special interest to the readers of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY is that (for the first time, I think), the problem of peace is made subsidiary to Christian moral ineffectiveness in the world, and that ineffectiveness is made subsidiary to the disunity among Christians. Its final pages are a plea for an eirenic attitude and policy towards our separated brethren.

On certain points, not essential to his argument, G.C. is not altogether accurate, *e.g.*, in his summary of the findings of Dvorink, Grumel and the others (p. 17). This is a very great pity, as it gives a gratuitous handle to any polemical critics (if such there be) who may want to discredit G.C.'s "line of country" without criticizing it too closely.

D.A.

Missionarismul Crestin Intre Mahomedani in Orientalu Apropiat.
By the Archimandrite Antim Nica Balti. Roumania. Lei.
120.

This is a most interesting book. Within a short compass the author has succeeded in giving us an excellent survey of missionary work amongst Mahomedans in all parts of the world. Beginning with a brief account of the rise and spread of Islam and of the attitude—progressively less favourable—of the early Caliphs towards Christianity, in the subjugated countries, he passes on in Chapter II to review the first missionary attempts amongst Moslems. These took the form mainly of public disputations or of polemical writings. Amongst the latter may be specially noted those of St. John Damascene (+760) who held an important post at the Court of the Caliph of Damascus. The author considers that the Crusades did much to embitter Moslem feeling against Christianity. In the eighteenth century, however, St. Francis of Assisi is found preaching amongst Mahomedans in Spain and the Holy Land and penetrating into Egypt, where he entertained great hopes—apparently unfulfilled—of converting the Sultan El-Kamil to Christianity. A still greater missionary amongst Mahomedans was the saintly Raymond Lull (+1315) who devoted his whole life to preaching Christianity amongst Mahomedans and suffered martyrdom at their hands in 1315. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries other missionaries from the West took up the work, notably St. Francis Xavier in India and Persia. In the East, too, missionary effort

was not lacking, but owing to the unfavourable position of the Eastern Church in lands subjugated by Mahomedan rulers, the work was more difficult and was chiefly of a literary character. Nevertheless Christianity exercised considerable influence on the surrounding Mahomedanism, and converts were made to Christianity although the penalty of conversion to Christianity was death.

In Chapter III the author passes on to more modern times and describes the missionary activities—chiefly in Persia and Iraq—of various missionary societies and religious Orders, Anglican, Protestant and Roman Catholic. The Russian Church also, before the Revolution, had a flourishing mission at Urumia, with a cathedral, missionary theological college, hospital and other benevolent institutions.

It is to be regretted, however, that in so many cases the difficulty of work amongst Mahomedans led the missionaries to concentrate their energies on converting the indigenous Christians to their respective denominations—apparently an easier task. Work was also attempted in Turkey, but with very small success.

In Chapter IV, which deals with Syria and Palestine, we are given a very interesting account of the work of the Russian Church in Palestine before the Revolution. It began with the Russian Jerusalem Mission founded in 1847, under the guidance of the Archimandrite Porphyrie Uspenski. This energetic priest founded many schools for Arab children, a hospital and a missionary monastery of the Holy Archangels in Jerusalem. He was succeeded by an equally enthusiastic missionary, the Archimandrite Antony, who alone traversed the length and breadth of Palestine on a donkey, in order to buy from the Mahomedans various sites connected with the life of our Lord and of the early Christians. He built the Church of the Holy Ascension on the Mount of Olives, where his body rests. The work of this Russian Jerusalem Mission received a new impetus from the creation of the Palestine Orthodox Society in 1882. The objects of this Society were (1) to assist and spread Orthodoxy in the Holy Places; (2) to encourage and facilitate pilgrimages to Palestine; (3) to organize schools, hospitals and various benevolent institutions, and (4) to encourage and publish scientific works on the past and present state of the Holy Places. This Society worked in collaboration with the Russian Jerusalem Mission and through its many branches carried on active work throughout Palestine and Syria, founding churches, schools, hospitals and dispensaries. It is specially interesting to note that one of these branches at Chisinau in Bessarabia has been revived in 1934

under Roumanian auspices, as an independent Society, called the "Society of the Holy Sepulchre." Its president is the Metropolitan of Bessarabia and its aims are identical with those of the Palestine Orthodox Society, but lack of funds has so far somewhat hampered its activities. The author of our book claims that the Russian Mission alone of all the missionary bodies at work in Palestine, understood the true rôle of the native Christians in the evangelization of the Mahomedans. They must be helped and restored to vigour after centuries of oppression before a real offensive against Mahomedanism can be undertaken, and this was recognized by the Russian Missions.

In his chapters on the Balkan countries the author gives us a most interesting account of the Gagauzes, a people of Turkish race but belonging to the Christian religion, who inhabit Bessarabia, the Dobrudja and the shores of the Black Sea. Many Gagauz monks are to be found in the monasteries of Bessarabia. They have produced one very notable Gagauz priest, Michel Ciachir, who translated the Bible, the liturgical books and other devotional works into the Gagauz tongue for the benefit of his people.

In Bulgaria we may specially note the Pomaks, native Bulgarians who became Mahomedan after the Turkish conquest. In 1877, after the battle of Plevna, there was a great movement amongst them to return to Christianity, but the Bulgarian clergy did not meet this movement with sufficient tact and sympathy, and the Pomaks are now very hostile to any missionary effort.

Chapter VII dealing with Russian Missions to Mahomedans prior to the Revolution is of great interest, as it shews from the lives and work of such great missionaries as Ilminski and Innocent and from the activities of the Orthodox Missionary Society and the brotherhood of St. Gurian that the reproach of being a non-missionary Church is unjust to the Orthodox Church.

In his closing chapters, VIII and IX, the author reviews the present position of Islam and the effects upon it of (1) modern Western culture and (2) the rise of an acute nationalism. These he finds to have a weakening and disintegrating effect upon Islam and thereby to offer a fresh opportunity to Christian effort. The latter he considers to be hampered by disunity amongst Christians, especially in the mission field, and by their failure to lead a truly Christian life. He quotes the words of the Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem when he was once asked when the Mahomedans would turn to our Lord. The Patriarch replied that this would happen when we who

call ourselves His followers shew forth Christ in our lives. Few thoughtful Christians would disagree with him.

M. G. DAMPIER.

Die Kirche Christi. Edited by Otto Iserland. (Benziger, Einsiedeln). Pp. 495. No price.

This is perhaps the first of many books of its kind. The Editor's Preface explains that although the Church has up till now been unable to participate actively in the œcumenical movement of the Life and Work and Faith and Order conferences, Catholics are in full sympathy with that movement's aim and appreciate its spirit. The turning of the movement towards the deepest bases of Christianity as the only genuine hope of unity has made possible even closer co-operation by Catholics, who have collaborated in more than one œcumenical collection of essays. Herr Iserland, a layman, has here obtained the collaboration of Catholic thinkers in a collection of short studies on the basic problems "which are fundamental to the beginning and to the ending of the cleavage of Christendom" (p. 7). His aim is to stir up Catholics to the consideration and implementing of "the spiritual demands set forth by this book" (p. 8), and to furnish non-Catholics with clear, unargumentative and authoritative information on the Catholic position in the main problems confronting the œcumenical movement. The collaborators have endeavoured to "translate" into a language and thought-form intelligible to non-Catholics the Catholic ideas usually expressed in scholastic terms and framework. The editor, who deserves our gratitude for his open attitude and for conceiving a book of this nature, took care of the translation into German of the contributions.

The eschewing of controversy and the confronting of fundamentals, enforced by contact with the œcumenical movement, have produced a series of studies which set a good example to Catholic spiritual writers, who still appear to be in a deep scholastic sleep. The subtitle of the book runs "Basic questions for the Determining of Mankind and of the Universe." The studies are as follows: *The Church and Her Unity*—Christ's Mystical Body and Its Visible Manifestation, by Fr. M.-J. Congar, O.P.; *Man in the Church as a Cult-Community*—(i) Christian Man seen by the Liturgy, and his Supernatural Realization in the Sacraments, by Abbot Vonier; (ii) The Church's Worship in its meaning and influence on Social Life, by Dom Anselme Robeyns; *How the Church upholds and uplifts the natural Order*—(i) Nature and Grace, by Fr. Gerald Vann, O.P.; (ii) The natural Order

in its creaturely and in its redeemed Significance, by P. Cassian Weier, O.S.B. (Maria Laach, Germany). Fr. Congar's study of the Church sums up his work in *Chrétiens Désunis*. He gives a straightforward explanation, based almost entirely on texts from Holy Scripture, very well-chosen and numerous, of the Church as the Mystical Body manifesting herself to the world in the outward structure of the Catholic and Roman system, which is the necessary material safeguard and expression of her inward nature and unity. The meaning of the Sacraments for the life of the soul and for the development of character, and the power of the Church's worship to prevent class-consciousness among Catholics form the subject of the liturgical essays. Fr. Gerald Vann gives us M. Maritain's philosophy of Christian integration and co-operation, and P. Cassian Weier defends the Catholic idea of the natural order against the misconceived notion of the Church's position found in an essay in the collection "Christian Faith and the Common Life" (London, 1938).

The result is a collection of some importance, deserving to be widely read because it inspires reflection and opens possibilities. The liturgical essays will be very valuable because they stress in a clear-cut way the necessary and basic position of the liturgy in every phase of Catholic spiritual and material life. They also insist very strongly on the social character of every part of Christian life, especially the spiritual part. Fr. Congar and the other authors have also done their best to show that Christian life is essentially a social and sacramental life, and Fr. Congar hints at the cosmological significance of the Church and shows some awareness of the demands of present-day Catholic movements for a total Christian outlook which shall redeem men becoming more and more peremptory in their demand for totality. The opportunities which bristle from the subjects chosen have not, then, been completely neglected, but the book is certainly open to the criticism that it hovers between the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. The impression it makes is that the subjects were not chosen spontaneously, but were suggested from outside. There is no objection to taking such suggestions from non-Catholic thought, especially when we are writing to explain the Church's position in the problems concerned. But we must remember that the wide sweep of the problems dealt with in this book gives the measure of the true spirit of the Church. Her thought, sometimes silent and replaced by narrower conceptions, is always concerned with such wide realities when her members allow her to be true to herself. When we seek the answer to such problems, then, we must

not, as the writers of this book have done, limit the scope of our minds to some partial thought-system (in this case the scholastic system) which is inadequate to solve questions it would never have dreamt of framing. These problems may be suggested from without, they are nevertheless susceptible of a solution coming from within, and must not be treated as foreigners to be fitted as well as possible into a system not conceived for them.

But how could our authors have answered the problems before them? How could they have overcome the lack of co-ordination visible between their different panaceas? Fr. Congar and Fr. Gerald Vann seem to think the Christian solution lies in the exercise of the different virtues. The liturgical essays hope men will be Christianized by assistance at the public worship of the Church. All take the Church as the *organization* of individual man into a *collective* unity. Had the Fathers, especially the pre-Augustinian Fathers, been consulted, what a different picture of the Church and of her relations with mankind and the universe would have resulted! Fr. Congar's essay particularly suffers from limited outlook—the Scripture quotations are plentiful, but his only other author is St. Thomas. It would have been far more Thomistic to base the whole essay on Ignatius and Irenaeus. And is not the Church the supernaturalization of a mankind which owes its essential sociality to the unicity of its spiritual-material nature rather than to the satisfying of a purely animal need for social life? Man is more than an "animal sociale," and naturally and supernaturally he forms an organic and not a collective society. It is difficult too to separate cultural life from the rest of Christian life—our life is a whole, demanding a whole mentality behind it. This Christian mentality is the reflection on the level of thought of a fact—the Redemption of the world by Christ. This fact is present on all the levels of Christian life from the Mass outward; because present first at Mass it may be called the liturgical fact, and the mentality expressing it may be called the liturgical philosophy. It is against this background, the true Catholic one, Christocentric, cosmological, organic and total, real and not intellectualistic, lately heavily stressed by at least one Catholic writer in English, that all the authors should have taken their stand. We are surprised to see so many references in Fr. Vann's essay to non-Catholic English writers—but none to even more pertinent Catholic literature. And it may well be that in the development of this full Catholic philosophy lies the vocation and mission of English Catholic thought.

DOM WILLIAM McLAUGHLIN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Orientalia Christiana Analecta, Rome :—

124, *Controverses Christologiques en Arméno-Cilicie*, by P. Pascal Tekeyan.

125, *Sakramenten theologie bei den syrischen Monophysiten*, by W. De Vries, S.J.

S.P.C.K. : *Two Ancient Christologies*, by R. V. Selliers, D.D.

Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd. : *Selections from St. John Chrysostom*, by Right Rev. J. F. D'Alton, D.D., D.Litt.

George G. Harrap, London : *The Bible and Archæology*, by Sir Frederic Kenyon.

Methuen & Co., Ltd., London : *Once in Sinai*, by J. M. C. Plowden.

Mowbray, London : *Ephrem the Syrian, an Eastern Contemplative* (Selections from the Syriac writings), with a study by Ann Anchor.

The Cambridge University Press : *Two Lives of St. Cuthbert* : B. Colgrave.

The Monastic Order in England : Dom David Knowles.

B. T. Batsford, Ltd. : *The Greater English Church* : Batsford.

George Allen and Unwin : *Islam and Christianity* : Looft Levonian.

